The Relationship of Certain Cultural Factors to Initiative in the Local Support of Education in Florida

By
GILBERT L. GENTRY

UNIVERSITY OF FLORIDA
January, 1959

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

vi

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

The schools of America have their roots deep in the culture
of the mother countries. The very warp and woof of American educa-
tion was hanked on the reels of our European antecedents.

The dominant pattern of support and control of American edu-
cation was born in an era of isolated farms and crossroad hamlets.
Local initiative made the difference between the presence or absence
of schooling for the youth. Local initiative was exterted in two
ways: (1) a cultural desire to help induct the young into the life
of the group, and (2) a desire to raise sufficient funds to support
an institution in order to accomplish the inductive act.

The United States is no longer a nation of isolated villages
and self-sufficient farms. Local communities are no longer self-
contained miniature societies. The America of today is a nation
joined together by economic, social, and political interdependency.

Vast numbers of school districts are not able to finance
the type of educational program their constituents desire. Support
for education has been obtained from other levels of government.
With the increase in financial assistance to local school districts
there has developed a mixed pattern of local financial effort and
initiative on the part of the school districts. Some districts are

1

content to operate at low level of financial support even though there are ample financial resources for greater expenditure. Other school districts are making local financial contributions at a high level in the face of limited financial resources. Why do these variations exist? Before exploring possible explanations the reader is directed to the over-all changes in government operation.

The Changing Role of Government

The role of government changes as a result of human motivations. The American people directly or indirectly through their elected representatives have changed and are changing the role of government at all levels. The older concept of government with a minimum of regulations and passive police power no longer operates in America. The newer concept of government has evolved with activities ranging from policing former enemy lands and operating hydro-electric power plants to the building of public housing projects and the provision of social insurance. With this change in the role of government has come an increase in public expenditures. Monetary expenditures are an expression of human actions. The American public has been motivated toward demanding or permitting a rise in the cost of government. Table 1 shows government expenditures for selected years. Table 2 shows government expenditures as a per cent of the aggregate selected years.[1] These data indicate a rise in total government

---

[1] The years included in Table 1 represent distinct periods in the economic cycle from 1890 through 1956, e.g., industrial expansion, war, post-war, economic depression, and economic "boom."

TABLE 1

GOVERNMENT EXPENDITURES FOR SELECTED YEARS
(In Millions of Dollars)

Year	Federal	State	Local	Total
1890	$ 318	$ 88	$ 487	$ 893
1903	517	207	912	1,636
1913	697	359	1,607	2,663
1918	12,648	553	1,966	15,167
1923	3,054	1,195	4,056	8,305
1929	2,957	1,928	6,051	10,936
1936	8,611	2,419	5,320	16,350
1940	8,824	3,612	5,640	18,076
1945	98,360	3,750	5,015	107,125
1952	65,999	8,653	17,444	92,096
1954	68,797	10,108	20,593	99,498
1956	64,173	12,319	24,392	100,884

Source: The Economic Almanac for 1942-43. (New York: National
Industrial Conference Board, 1942). Data for 1890-1936, from 1942 volume,
p. 408; data for 1940-1956, from 1958 volume, p. 428.

TABLE 2

GOVERNMENT EXPENDITURES AS A PER CENT OF THE AGGREGATE FOR SELECTED YEARS

Year	Federal	State	Local	Total
1890	35.6%	9.9%	54.5%	100.0%
1903	31.6	12.7	55.7	100.0
1913	26.2	13.5	60.3	100.0
1918	83.4	3.6	13.0	100.0
1923	36.8	14.4	48.8	100.0
1929	27.0	17.6	55.4	100.0
1936	52.7	14.8	32.5	100.0
1940	48.8	20.0	31.2	100.0
1945	91.8	3.5	4.7	100.0
1952	71.7	9.4	18.9	100.0
1954	69.1	10.2	20.7	100.0
1956	63.6	12.2	24.2	100.0

Derived from data presented in Table 1.

expenditure from less than one billion dollars in 1890 to nearly
101 billion dollars in 1956. The per cent of public expenditure
by level of government indicated a strong reliance on local govern-
ment for public finance from 1890 until the 1930's. Exception
should be made for the period of World War I. Since the 1930's
there has been a decline in the per cent of total public expendi-
ture made by local governments. State government expenditures have
held a more constant ratio with the exception of the periods of
World War I, World War II, and the Korean conflict. The major shift
in distribution of public expenditures has been from local government
to federal government.

The extent of government operation in many fields can be
revealed by examining the purpose of public expenditures. Table
3 shows government expenditure according to function and level for
the fiscal years 1952 and 1956.

Table 4 shows major government expenditures as a per cent
of the total for the years 1952 and 1956. These data indicate that
national defense and education are the two largest expenditures when
aggregate government expenditures are examined. Defense represents
the largest expenditure item for the national government. Highways
are the largest expenditure for state government. Education and
public welfare represent major expenditures for state government.
Education is the largest expenditure for local government. Shults
and Harriss make the following observation concerning expenditure
of public funds:

TABLE 3

GOVERNMENT EXPENDITURES ACCORDING TO FUNCTION AND LEVEL FOR SELECTED YEARS

(In Millions of Dollars)

Function	1952[a]				1956[b]			
	All Government	Federal	State	Local	All Government	Federal	State	Local
Total direct gen. expenditures	$92,875	$66,777	$8,654	$17,444	$100,884	$64,173	$12,319	$24,392
National defense	39,990	39,990	—	—	40,447	40,447	—	—
International assistance	5,189	5,189	—	—	1,928	1,928	—	—
Postal service	2,612	2,612	—	—	2,899	2,899	—	—
Education	9,598	1,280	1,494	6,824	14,161	940	2,138	11,082
Elem. and sec.	6,867	61	115	6,691	11,199	35	219	10,946
All other	2,731	1,219	1,379	133	2,961	906	1,919	136
Highways	4,724	64	2,556	2,094	7,035	82	4,367	2,586
Public welfare	2,830	42	1,410	1,378	3,185	45	1,603	1,536
Health and hospitals	3,199	1,014	1,132	1,053	3,739	967	1,470	1,302
Police	1,080	141	106	833	1,487	156	159	1,172

TABLE 3—Continued

Function	1952[a]				1956[b]			
	All Government	Federal	State	Local	All Government	Federal	State	Local
Local fire protection	$ 586	—	—	586	737	—	—	737
Natural resources	5,021	4,245	539	237	5,046	4,140	670	236
Sanitation	992	—	—	992	1,326	—	—	1,326
Housing and community development	875	106	4	766	1,103	125	2	976
Veteran's service	2,570	2,428	142	—	3,185	3,097	88	—
Non-highway transportation	945	713	43	189	1,277	872	57	349
General control	1,797	604	361	832	2,235	675	477	1,083
Interest and debt service	6,405	5,853	144	408	7,317	6,331	311	675
Other	4,472	2,497	722	1,252	3,776	1,467	977	1,332

[a]Source: Bureau of the Census, Summary of Governmental Finances 1952, November, 1953, p. 30.

[b]Source: Ibid., 1956, August, 1957, pp. 26-27.

TABLE 4

MAJOR GOVERNMENT EXPENDITURES ACCORDING TO FUNCTION AND LEVEL
FOR SELECTED YEARS

Function	Per Cent of Total Expenditure	
	1952	1956
All Government		
National defense	40.3%	40.1%
Education	10.3	10.1
Interest and debt service	6.9	7.2
Foreign aid	5.6	1.9
Natural resources	5.4	5.0
Highways	5.1	6.9
Health and hospitals	3.4	3.7
Public welfare	3.0	3.2
Veteran's service	2.8	3.2
Federal Government		
National defense	60.0%	63.0%
Interest and debt service	8.7	9.8
Foreign aid	7.7	2.8
Natural resources	6.5	6.4
Veteran's service	3.6	4.8
State Government		
Highways	29.5%	35.4%
Education	17.2	17.3
Public welfare	16.2	13.0
Health and hospitals	13.1	11.1
Local Government		
Education	39.2%	45.4%
Highways	12.0	10.6
Public welfare	8.9	6.2

Derived from data presented in Table 3.

In the past forty years, American government expenditure increased 22-fold on a per capita basis, more than four-fold in proportion to National income. Six major reasons for this stupendous rise are war and threats of war, national growth and urbanisation, expansion of public functions, rising price levels, business fluctuations, and growth of pressure-group tactics of political action.[2]

Revenue for the support of government comes from three major sources: (1) taxes, (2) government enterprises, and (3) government borrowing. Government enterprises operate competitively with private business. Government borrowing for current operation is mainly restricted to the federal government. Tax revenue has a common denominator with all levels of government. Taxes are the major source of revenue for all levels of government. Table 5 shows governmental tax revenue by source and by level for selected years. These data indicate the following trends:

1. The individual income tax and corporation income tax have become the leading sources of revenue for federal government. The individual income tax as a source of federal revenue moved from the third ranking source in 1942 to the first ranking source in 1955.

2. Sales, gross receipts, and customs are important sources of federal revenue but in 1955 their position was less important than in 1942. Sales and gross receipts taxes (customs are restricted to federal government) continue to be the major source of revenue for state government.

---

[2] William J. Shultz, C. Lowell Harriss, American Public Finance (6th ed.; New York: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1954), p. 12.

TABLE 5

GOVERNMENTAL TAX REVENUES BY SOURCE AND BY LEVEL FOR SELECTED YEARS
(In Millions of Dollars)

Year	Total	Individual Income	Corporation Income	Sales, Gross Receipts and Customs	Property	Death and Gift	License Permits and Other
				Total			
1942	$20,797	$ 3,527	$ 4,998	$ 5,685	$ 4,537	$ 530	$1,521
1945	50,075	18,727	15,547	8,454	4,802	769	1,776
1948	51,534	19,762	10,273	12,303	6,126	1,074	1,797
1951	63,535	22,569	14,795	14,936	7,926	906	2,452
1954	84,476	30,669	21,879	17,643	9,967	1,138	3,129
1955	84,072	29,984	18,604	17,221	10,735	1,182	3,345
				Federal			
1942	12,270	3,251	4,726	3,334	---	429	540
1945	40,882	18,344	15,089	6,020	---	636	793
1948	37,792	19,239	9,681	7,661	---	890	341
1951	46,031	21,696	14,101	9,117	---	708	409
1954	62,409	29,542	21,101	10,367	---	934	465
1955	57,589	28,747	17,861	9,578	---	924	478
				State			
1942	3,903	249	269	2,218	264	110	783
1945	4,307	357	453	2,278	276	132	811
1948	6,743	499	583	4,042	276	179	1,161
1951	8,933	805	687	5,208	346	196	1,631
1954	11,089	1,044	772	6,573	391	247	2,102
1955	11,597	1,094	737	6,834	412	249	2,241

TABLE 5—Continued

Year	Total	Individual Income	Corporation Income	Sales, Gross Receipts and Customs	Property	Death and Gift	License Permits and Other
				Local			
1942	$ 4,624	$ 27	$ 3	$ 133	$ 4,273	$ 1	$ 188
1945	4,886	26	5	156	4,526	1	172
1948	6,599	44	7	400	5,850	3	295
1951	8,621	68	7	551	7,580	3	411
1954	10,978	122	7	703	9,577	7	562
1955	11,886	143	7	779	10,323	8	625

Source: Statistical Abstract of the United States, 1958 (Washington, D. C.: Government Printing Office, 1958), p. 405.

3. The property tax remains the major source of revenue for local government.

Table 6 shows major governmental revenues as a per cent of the total for the year 1955. These data indicate personal income tax, corporate income tax, and the sum of sales, gross receipts, and customs are the three largest revenue sources when aggregate government expenditures are examined. Personal income tax and corporate income taxes are the two largest sources of revenue for the federal government. Sales and gross receipts taxes are the largest revenue source for state governments. Nearly 89 per cent of local government revenue comes from the property tax. The use of the several taxes by different levels of government is a mixture of constitutional, statutory, economics, and traditional considerations. The "best" source of revenue for any government remains a moot question.

The American choice of high cost in government operation carries with it certain changing fiscal relationships. Fiscal factors currently exercise a shaping influence on this country's economic development, and on many important forms of personal activity. A few illustrations of the present impact of fiscal factors are:

1. The decade of the 1950's is primarily concerned with cold war and the threat of hot war. National defense is the highest expenditure item of all government costs. National defense is a federal function but individuals help pay for national defense through higher federal income tax rates.

TABLE 6

MAJOR SOURCES OF GOVERNMENTAL TAX REVENUE BY LEVEL FOR 1955

Tax Revenue	Per Cent of Total Revenue
All Government	
Personal income tax	37.0
Corporation income tax	22.9
Sales, gross receipts and customs	21.2
Property tax	13.2
License, permits, etc.	4.1
All other taxes	1.6
Federal Government	
Personal income tax	49.9
Corporation income tax	31.0
Sales, gross receipts and customs	16.6
All other taxes	2.5
State Government	
Sales and gross receipts tax	59.2
License, permits, etc.	19.3
Personal income tax	9.4
All other taxes	12.1
Local Government	
Property tax	86.8
Sales and gross receipts tax	5.2
License, permits, etc.	6.5
All other taxes	1.5

Derived from data presented in Table 4.

2. The American public "buys" many aspects of the American mode of living through government activities--national protection, local police protection, education, highways and streets, legal system, social security, and many other intangible services. The cost of most of these services results in an additional tax burden.

3. Debt management with surplus or deficit spending changes the purchasing power of the dollar. These factors affect the inflation-deflation balance.

4. The level of employment is affected by fiscal policies. Government purchases of materials and supplies account for the employment of millions among the labor force. Several million government employees are regular buyers of consumer goods and increase the demand for these products.

5. High costs of all levels of government may create a depletion of private resources. There may be a point at which high taxation will discourage private initiative. However, it may be possible that the rise in government expenditures may continue to produce an expansive effect.

With the foregoing discussion as a background the reader is directed to one aspect of government operation--education and its financial support. In the year 1956, omitting national defense, the highest expenditure for all levels of government was for education.

The Role of Education and the
Financial Support of Education
in the United States

       Education in the American setting is a function delegated
to the state. State constitutions make the provision of education
mandatory. The courts in interpreting the role of the state in
making provision for education go far beyond permissiveness and
grant to the state plenary power. The power to maintain a system
of public education is similar to the police power, power to adminis-
ter justice, and the power to tax. The Supreme Court of Indiana
in the case of State v. Haworth denotes the position of the state
in relation to the educational enterprise as follows:

> Essentially and intrinsically the schools in which are
> educated and trained the children who are to become the
> rulers of the commonwealth are matters of State, and not
> local jurisdiction. In such matters, the State is the
> unit, and the Legislature the source of power. The authority
> over schools and school affairs is not necessarily a dis-
> tributive one to be exercised by local instrumentalities;
> but, on the contrary, it is a central power residing in the
> Legislature of the State. It is for the law-making power
> to determine whether the authority shall be exercised by a
> State board of education, or distributed to county, town-
> ship, or city organizations throughout the state. . . .
>
> As the power over schools is a legislative one, it is not
> exhausted by exercise. The Legislature having tried one
> plan is not precluded from trying another. It has a complete
> choice of methods, and may change its plans as often as it
> deems necessary or expedient. . . . It is clear, therefore,
> that even if it were true, that the Legislature had uni-
> formly intrusted the management of school affairs to local
> organizations, it would not authorize the conclusion that
> it might not change the system.[3]

---

[3]State v. Haworth, 122 Ind. 462.

Since the state has plenary power to maintain a system of public education there must go along with that power a legal framework for financial support. In the Tennessee case of State v. Meador, the role of the state in relation to public education and financial support of public education is expressed as follows:

> The public school system is a matter of state, and not local, concern, and the establishment, maintenance, and control of the public schools is a legislative function. To promote the public schools, the state, through the Legislature, may levy taxes directly, or the state, having, as it does, full control over its agencies, the counties, may authorize them to levy a tax, or may by statute require them to levy a tax for the establishment and maintenance of public schools. . . . The exercise of the taxing power to promote a system of public schools for all the counties does not infringe upon the right of local self-government, because a public school system, like a highway system, a penal system, or a matter of public health is not a purely local, but a state, concern. The state is a unit, and the Legislature is the state's source of legislative power, from which flows the mandate of the state.[4]

The state legislature has plenary power for legislation concerning education. The legislative power cannot be delegated. Administrative boards or agencies can be created for purposes of carrying out administrative duties. Frequently confusion develops due to the difficulty in distinguishing legislative power from administrative power. Edwards defines the test as follows:

> Does the act creating the administrative agency contain in it some reasonably clear standard by which the discretion of the agency is governed? Unless it does, it will be regarded as a delegation of legislative power. These standards circumscribing the discretion of the administrative agent have been referred to as "conditions, restrictions, limitations, yardsticks, guides, rules, broad

---

[4]State v. Meador, 284 S. W. (Tenn.) 890.

outlines," and the like. It has been held that in creating administrative tribunals "the power must be (canalised) so that the exercise of the delegated powers must be restrained by banks in a definitely defined channel."[5]

State boards of education, local boards of education, and school district trustees, by definition operate as administrative bodies and of themselves do not have legislative powers delegated to them. In carrying out their administrative duties it often becomes necessary to establish rules and policies which are referred to as administrative law. According to the principle presented by Edwards, all administrative law must fall within the "banks" of a definitely defined channel.

The expression "uniform system of schools" appears in the constitution of many states. For example, the Florida Constitution states: "The Legislature shall provide for a uniform system of public free schools and shall provide for the liberal maintenance of same."[6] Uniformity does not mean identical, lack of distinction, all classes alike. Distinctions must be based upon real distinctions and differences which apply equally to all persons or things in the same class or situation. In the case Ex Parte King it was stated:

> While arbitrary discriminations by the legislature between persons standing in the same relation to the subject of legislation will not be sustained by the courts, it is firmly settled that "a law is general and constitutional when it applies equally to all persons embraced in a class founded upon some natural or intrinsic or constitutional

---

[5] Newton Edwards, The Courts and the Public Schools (revised edition; Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1955), pp. 30-31.

[6] Florida Constitution (1885), Art. XII, Sec. 1.

distinction. . . . If the individuals to whom the legis-
lation is applicable constitute a class characterized by
some substantial qualities or attributes of such a charac-
ter as to indicate the legislation, if applicable to all
members of that class, is not violative of our constitutional
provisions against special legislation." . . . The question
whether the individuals affected by a law do constitute
such a class is primarily one for the legislative department
of the state, and it is hardly necessary to cite authorities
for the proposition that when such a legislative classifi-
cation is attacked in the courts every presumption is in
favor of the validity of the legislative act.[7]

Uniformity within the framework of treating like classes alike
must be examined in relation to changing concepts of class distinc-
tions. There are many valid classifications which comply with the
meaning of uniformity, among them are population for classification
of districts, consolidation of districts, transportation at public
expense, non-transportation for extremely isolated pupils, and also
age and sex.

In summary, education is a function of the state. The state
has the responsibility for establishing a means for financial support
of education. The state and the state alone has legislative power
while the local school district is given administrative power. The
type of educational program prescribed by the state and conducted
by the local school district must be in conformity with the prevail-
ing concept of uniformity and within the Supreme Court interpreta-
tion of the Federal Constitution.

Recent decades have found gross changes in the demands on
the educational enterprise. The strong position of the local

[7]Ex Parte King, 157 Calif. 161.

administrative unit as the main source of financial support has been weakened in many school districts. The fiscal capacity of certain school districts is inadequate for the support of the type of educational enterprise the American public demands. As a partial answer to these demands, support from higher levels of government has increased. With the changes in sources of financial support certain issues arise. Morphet and Lindman suggest the following:

1. How much should the citizens of each state and community invest in the support of their public schools?
2. To what extent should the taxpayers on one area be expected to make a greater effort than those of another area to provide a reasonably adequate educational program?
3. To what extent should control be permitted or encouraged to follow the school dollar?
4. To what extent should local initiative and responsibility be encouraged?
5. What proportion of the funds for school support should come from state sources?
6. Should there be a "partnership" program of school support, or should the state undertake to support a foundation program entirely from state revenue?
7. Should the taxpayers of an entire state be expected to help pay the extra expenses of operating numerous small schools or maintaining small inefficient districts?
8. Can adequate educational opportunities be assured by providing state support for only certain portions of the program?
9. What should be the place of the general property tax in the school support program?
10. What steps should be taken to improve state school finance programs?
11. What is an adequate foundation program of education?[8]

Many studies have been made of the issues as categorized by Morphet and Lindman; and from these studies have emerged certain

[8]Edgar L. Morphet and Erick L. Lindman, Public School Finance Programs of the Forty-Eight States (Washington, D. C.: Federal Security Agency, Office of Education, Government Printing Office, 1950), pp. 4-8.

generally accepted characteristics of a satisfactory educational

support program. Morphet lists the following:

1. The basic plan of financing public schools should guaran-
   tee all children an equal opportunity for an adequate
   foundation program of education. There should be only
   one foundation program for all school systems and schools
   in the state, regardless of type or location.
2. Insofar as practicable this foundation program should
   be defined by law rather than by central administrative
   authority. It may be defined in terms of educational
   opportunities to be provided as well as in terms of the
   amount of money required from state and local sources
   to put it into operation.
3. The foundation program should be financed jointly by
   the state and local school systems in accordance with
   an equitable plan which assures that the program will
   be adequately supported throughout the state. This
   requires the establishment of an equitable partnership
   between the state as a whole and the individual school
   systems responsible for operating the schools. Such
   a partnership plan should assure the financing of an
   acceptable educational offering in all local school
   systems, regardless of their taxpaying ability.
4. The foundation program should be defined to include all
   essential school services and facilities; the plan for
   financing the program should cover all essential ele-
   ments of school costs.
5. The definition of the foundation program in terms of
   costs should be such as to assure insofar as practicable
   a suitable level of educational opportunity in the state.
   While the program must necessarily be projected in
   terms of the resources available, it should be considered
   and planned as a step toward an adequate program.
6. The cost of the defined foundation program should repre-
   sent a major portion of the total school expenditures
   within the state. It should be as good a program as the
   people of the state are willing and able to support on
   a partnership basis. Nevertheless, it should be con-
   sidered a minimum beyond which the citizens of any local
   school system may go at their discretion.
7. Measures of educational need used in arriving at the
   cost of the program should be as simple, equitable, and
   objective as practicable. They should automatically
   take into account all cost elements essential to the
   provision of a like program in all communities, regard-
   less of population density or similar factors. Care

should be exercised, however, to avoid including direct or indirect rewards for preserving status quo, particularly for unjustified small districts and small schools.

8. The state-wide foundation program should be developed through state-wide participation, study, and discussion.

9. When conditions warrant the temporary use of state finance to stimulate or direct local action through special aids, earmarked foundation programs, or extensions of foundation program elements, the allowances should be adequate to meet the needs if inequities are to be avoided.

10. The basic plan for state financing of education should encourage the development of local school administrative units and attendance areas large enough to facilitate operation of complete, economical and efficient educational programs. Rewards for inefficiency should be carefully avoided.

11. For satisfactory operation of a partnership foundation program in any state, adequate and equitable measures of local financial ability should be developed and used. These should reflect as clearly as possible the potential ability of local school systems to raise funds for school support.

12. The basis of measuring local financial ability to support the foundation program should be uniform and should apply to all local school systems in the state.

13. The contribution required of local school systems toward the cost of the foundation program should be based on an equalized and equitable assessment of property or other valid and reliable measure of fiscal ability in the several local school systems throughout the state.

14. The exercise of local initiative necessitates local taxing power and a local tax base which is not unduly restricted or overburdened. Handicapping limits on local property taxes for schools should be removed, and all local school systems which desire to do so should be permitted and encouraged to go beyond the foundation program.

15. The state should provide for each local school system the difference between the amount of local required contribution and the objectively determined cost of the foundation program for the system.

16. The state's contribution to the support of the foundation program should be large enough to avoid placing an unduly heavy tax burden on local school systems.

17. State appropriations for the support of the foundation program should be provided in accordance with a plan which assures the additional funds will be available as needed to meet increased attendance of pupils and

other changes that automatically result in increased costs.

18. The limited extension of the state foundation program beyond the equalization function to include the participation of all local school systems in the general financial support is desirable in that it gives all such units a sense of belonging to the total educational structure rather than to a special group set apart from the rest of the school systems in the state.

19. One effect of the state support plan should be to develop a sense of responsibility among citizens and local school units for the education of all children throughout the state, wherever they may live.

20. Systems of financing state programs of education should be designed purposely to strengthen local responsibility and control of the public schools.

21. While the state should have the major responsibility for providing adequate leadership and service it should, when necessary, establish those minimum standards, and only those, which are universally applicable, are designed primarily to assure minimum opportunities for all children, and in no way limit the freedom of the local school unit to go beyond the state's minimum standards in education.

22. Compliance features and breakdowns of the foundation program into functions and objects should be avoided in state finance systems whenever there is reasonable possibility that local school systems with increased funds will exercise wise judgment in the development of their educational programs. Special controls necessary to protect the educational rights of children under circumstances of educational expediency should be accompanied by provisions for automatically terminating them as soon as possible.

23. In making decisions regarding control, preference should be given to retaining control locally, particularly for those elements concerning which there is no certainty that central authority will produce the best long-term results.

24. The advantages of close popular control over local educational programs should be protected and promoted by avoiding inhibiting controls over boards of education, local school programs, or school funds by municipal, county, state, or other non-educational authorities.

25. All state funds for schools should be distributed on strictly objective bases that can be computed as readily by the local school system as by the state department of education. The principle of local responsibility

requires the avoidance of granting to central state offi-
cials discretionary powers relating to the distribution
of funds which may result in subjective controls.[9]

Florida has been operating a foundation program for the

support of education for 11 years. The major purpose of the Florida

foundation program is to establish an equitable and satisfactory

means for financing an acceptable minimum educational program.

The general procedure for establishing the Florida foundation pro-

gram is as follows:

1. Determine what constitutes an acceptable minimum edu-
   cational program for each child to be educated.

2. Establish formulae for calculating the cost of the ac-
   ceptable minimum program for a unit of education, e.g.,
   for twenty-seven pupils in average daily attendance.

3. Determine the cost of the entire program for the state
   or county by multiplying the cost of one unit by the
   number of units in the county or in the state.

4. Formulae are established for allocating a portion of
   the cost to the local units and the balance to the state.

In theory the share allocated to the local unit is related to the

ability of the local unit to pay and leaves the local unit leeway

for enrichment of the educational program above and beyond the minimum.

[9] National Conference of Professors of Educational Administra-
tion, Problems and Issues in Public School Finance (New York: Bureau
of Publications, Teachers College, Columbia University, 1952), pp. 154-58.

Need for Study

Burke suggests three important questions to be answered about the operational effects of a foundation program:

1. Does it provide the maximum achievable improvement in the educational offerings of low-ability school systems?
2. Does it provide an equitable vehicle for the distribution of state finance to the vast majority of local units which should and can exceed any minimum guaranteed by the state?
3. Does it foster local initiative and the strengthening of local operations, or does it tend to foster dependence upon state actions for school improvement in most local units?[10]

In this study the local expansion of financial support to increase educational opportunity beyond the state foundation program minimum level will be called "local financial initiative."

School district revenues come from federal, state, and local sources. Federal funds generally provide a small proportion of school expenditures for a state or its school districts. The foundation program establishes a ratio between the amount of state revenue and local revenue for one year for the individual counties. In Florida, state funds amount to a substantial per cent of the total school expenditure. The required amount of local expenditure is determined by an "index of taxpaying ability,"[11] which is a composite of several measures of financial ability. The individual county contribution is determined as the product of the county index of taxpaying ability times the yield from a six-mill levy against the

[10]Arvid J. Burke, Financing Public Schools in the United States (New York: Harper and Brothers, 1957), p. 581.

[11]Florida, Revised Statutes (1957), sec. 236.071.

aggregate assessed valuation of non-exempt property in the state,
assuming 95 per cent collection.

The amount of revenue a county can contribute toward the
support of education is limited in part by local restrictions.
Some of the restrictions on local support in Florida are:

1. The constitutional limitation of not less than
   a three mill nor more than a ten mill county-
   wide levy.

2. The prerogative of the freeholders to vote district
   school taxes of zero to ten mills.

3. The laws and customs which prevail in the matter
   of assessing the values of property.

4. The provision for a $5,000 homestead exemption.

Further limitation on county financial contribution may
reside in legislative changes relating to subtle effects within
the state-local formulation. Leps and Qualls examined the 1957
legislative enactments and sound the following warning:

> If the state policy is to leave counties some local tax-
> ing leeway to provide educational programs above the guaran-
> teed minimum, it may be desirable to revise the formula
> for calculating the required county contribution. Other-
> wise the effect on school finance will be to reduce the
> state's contribution in proportion to the increase in local
> assessments.[12]

Granted Florida has a restricted tax base, handicapping limits on
local property taxes for schools and imperfections in state-local

---

[12]Joseph M. Leps, and LeRoy L. Qualls, "Financing Public
Schools in Florida, 1957-58," Economic Leaflets, Vol. XVII, No. 21
(February, 1958), p. 4.

formulation, there still exists some latitude for local financial
initiative. The formulae of the state foundation program allow
some tax leeway for all school districts.

It is the purpose in this dissertation to examine factors
and conditions which seem to afford a climate in which local interest
and initiative in the school program flourishes most satisfactorily.
Johns indicates the needed study as follows:

> . . . Why these variations in tax effort among local schools
> with the same per pupil wealth? Unfortunately there is
> available very little research on that point. The people
> are using their power of initiative and their freedom to
> tax in some districts and in others they are not. Two
> hypotheses for explaining these differences immediately
> suggest themselves—these differences in local tax effort
> might be explained in the cultural level of the people
> or by differences in the quality of educational leadership.[13]

Rosenstengel and Eastmond add a third dimension to the problem:

> Local initiative on the part of a community is dependent
> on many factors. It is related to the public's understand-
> ing about schools. It is known to have some relationship
> to the social, economic, and demographic characteristics
> of the district's population. It may be enhanced or cul-
> tivated by effective district administration of a sound
> public relations program. And most important of all, it
> is closely related to the design and operation of the state's
> school support program.[14]

Cornell and McLoone further explain the existing situation:

> . . . more studies are needed to show the factorial compo-
> sition of elements in the financial picture.[15]

[13]National Conference of Professors of Educational Administra-
tion, op. cit., p. 236.

[14]William E. Rosenstengel, and Jefferson N. Eastmond, School
Finance Its Theory and Practice (New York: The Ronald Press Company,
1957), p. 74.

[15]Francis G. Cornell, and Eugene P. McLoone, "Finance and Ma-
terial Management," Review of Educational Research, Vol. XXV, No. 4
(October, 1955), p. 354.

Further examination of the literature seems to justify the need for this study.

In order to make studies of local financial initiative, one of the first things needed is a scale for the measurement of financial initiative. There is need for a type of measure that will reveal on a comparative basis the standing of counties with regard to certain known variables in the support structure for education in the state of Florida.

Johns[16] used a technique for measuring local tax effort based upon the ratio of local school tax revenue to equalized assessed valuation of non-exempt property. Myers[17] used the same type of ratio in a study of financial effort for Florida. McClure[18] approaches a possible measure of local financial initiative in the study of the state foundation program in Illinois. The scale of local financial initiative for this study was a measure of the local financial effort above the minimum required local contribution for participation in the state foundation program. There does not appear to be any existing measure or study revealing the amount of financial initiative exerted by the several counties in Florida.

---

[16]Public Schools of Davidson County, Tennessee (Nashville: Division of Surveys and Field Studies, George Peabody College for Teachers, 1949), pp. 203-206.

[17]Herman C. Myers, "A Study of Certain Phases of Tax Effort in Relation to Taxpaying Ability in Florida," unpublished Master's thesis, University of Florida, 1950, pp. 19-20.

[18]William P. McClure, An Analysis of the Illinois Foundation Program of Public Support (Urbana: Bureau of Research and Service, College of Education, University of Illinois, 1952), pp. 15-28.

Such a measure is needed and will be a valuable contribution to
the field of education finance.

The second phase of this study was the examination of
certain cultural characteristics of the population in relation to
financial initiative. There is need to discover what characteris-
tics of a culture are relationship to local financial initiative.
Only a limited number of cultural characteristics were included
in this study. Within the limitations of this study some progress
was made toward identifying the cultural climate which produces
greater local financial initiative toward the support of schools.

Statement of the Problem

The problem in this study is to examine the relationship
of certain cultural factors to initiative in the local support
of education in Florida.

Major Hypothesis

Local financial initiative for the support of schools exists
in varying degrees among the several counties in Florida. There are
certain cultural factors and conditions that afford a climate in
which local interest and initiative in the school support program
flourish most satisfactorily.

Purpose of the Study

It is the purpose in this study to investigate certain rela-
tionships between selected cultural characteristics of the individual

counties in Florida and the willingness of those counties to vote
higher taxes for the support of schools.

Definition of Terms

1. <u>Gross level of financial support</u>.--Gross level of fi-
nancial support consists of the sum of all school revenue per unit
of educational load.

2. <u>Gross local level of financial support</u>.--Gross local
level of financial support consists of the sum of all local school
revenue, including Racing Commission funds, per unit of educational
load.

3. <u>Local financial ability</u>.--Local financial ability is
the aggregate value of equalized assessed valuation of non-exempt
property per unit of educational load.

4. <u>Local financial effort</u>.--Local financial effort is de-
fined as the ratio in mills of local school tax revenue to equalized
assessed valuation of non-exempt property.

5. <u>Local financial initiative</u>.--Local financial initiative
is the ratio in mills of local school tax revenue beyond the required
contribution for participation in the state foundation program to
equalized assessed valuation of non-exempt property.

6. <u>Social climate</u>.--Social climate for purposes of this
dissertation is defined as an index derived from the analysis of
certain cultural aspects which are associated with the financial
initiative of a county to support education.

7. Unit of educational load.--The unit of educational load is a weighted measure of the impact of pupil population upon the county school system in terms of cost. The measure developed is a composite of weighted instruction and transportation units.

Delimitations of Study

1. This study was limited to financial initiative and no attempt was made to evaluate the quality of program purchased with the funds expended.

2. Inasmuch as there is an indefinitely large number of variables in the county financial support structure for the state of Florida it was necessary to select for study a certain number which seem promising.

3. Only a limited number of cultural characteristics of the county population were included.

4. While the factor of quality of educational leadership is considered important it was outside the bounds of this particular study.

Method of Study

The method of showing the relationship of certain cultural factors to local financial initiative in the support of education was developed in the following sequence:

1. The financial ability for the several counties was measured.

2. The local financial effort for the support of schools in the several counties was measured.

3. The local financial initiative for the support of schools in the several counties was measured.

4. The social climate for the several counties was measured.

5. The interaction of social climate, local initiative, and local ability was examined.

Details of the procedures which were followed in collecting and processing data for each of the sequential steps are included in the chapters in which each step is developed.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF RELATED STUDIES

The relationship of certain cultural factors to initiative
in the local support of education is closely associated with the
state plan of financial support of education. Morphet,[1] Cornell,
and McClure[2] reviewed the characteristics of state support programs
in general and state foundation programs in particular. The review
of state plans for financing education was documented by a selective
list of 95 surveys, related descriptions, and specific research.

The characteristics of the state support program in Florida
prior to the implementation of the state foundation program was
reviewed in the 1947 report of the Florida Citizens Committee on
Education.[3] Status studies of the Florida foundation program have
been made during the intervening years by the Florida Legislative
Council,[4,5] Florida State Department of Education,[6] and Leps and

_____

[1]National Conference of Professors of Educational Administration, Problems and Issues in Public School Finance (New York:
Teachers College, Columbia University, 1952), pp. 149-218.

[2]Ibid., pp. 195-218.

[3]Education and the Future of Florida (Tallahassee: Florida
Citizens Committee on Education, 1947), pp. 221-234.

[4]Five Years of the Minimum Foundation Program (Tallahassee:
Florida Legislative Council, 1953).

[5]Financing Public Schools Under the Florida Minimum Foundation Program (Tallahassee: Florida Legislative Council and Reference
Bureau, 1957).

[6]Florida's Minimum Foundation Program (Tallahassee: Florida
State Department of Education, 1956).

32

Qualls,[7] Kretschmar,[8] Simmons,[9] and Walker[10] analyzed individual county operation under the state foundation program.

The relationship of certain cultural factors to initiative in the local support of education rests upon a broad background of research in the areas of school finance and sociological description. The findings are presented in the following order:

    I. Finance studies

        A. Educational load
        B. Financial ability
        C. Financial effort
        D. Financial initiative

    II. Sociological description studies

        A. Regional description
        B. Subregional description

    III. Studies relating sociological description
         to school finance

School Finance Studies

The incidence of pupil population upon the local school district is related to local financial ability. Probably the oldest measure of educational load was the pupil population census. More

---

[7]Joseph M. Leps and LeRoy L. Qualls, "Financing Public Schools in Florida, 1957-58," *Economic Leaflets*, Vol. XVII, No. 21 (February, 1958).

[8]Ernest L. Kretschmar, "A Study of the Effects of the Minimum Foundation Program Law Upon the Schools of Manatee County," unpublished Master's thesis, University of Florida, 1950.

[9]Russell Simmons, "A Study of the Effects of the Minimum Foundation Program on Washington County Schools and the Implications for Future Development," unpublished Master's thesis, University of Florida, 1953.

[10]Elizabeth Duncan Walker, "The Effects of the Minimum Foundation School Program on the Public Schools of Orange County, Florida," unpublished Master's thesis, University of Florida, 1950.

refined measures of educational load have been derived from averages,
e.g., average daily attendance, average daily membership, or average
enrollment. Weighted measures of educational load have been developed
in order to compensate for variables that affect school cost. Nation-
wide studies require measures of educational load that can be applied
to each of the 48 states without regard for complexities of school
district organization. The United States Office of Education,[11] and
the National Education Association[12,13] studies are examples of
nation-wide application of counting and averages for measuring educa-
tional load. Morphet and Lindman[14] made a general survey of the
measurement of educational load as related to apportionment of school
funds. The National Education Association[15] issues an annual report
for each state which includes a description of the methods for
measuring educational load in relation to school finance.

The present study involves the measurement of educational
load in relation to cost. The state foundation program has measures

---

[11]Biennial Survey of Education in the United States: 1952-54
(Washington, D. C.: U. S. Department of Health, Education, and
Welfare, Office of Education, Government Printing Office, 1956).

[12]Ranking of the States (Washington, D. C.: National Education
Association, Research Division, 1957).

[13]Educational Differences Among the States (Washington: D. C.:
National Education Association, Research Division, 1954).

[14]Edgar L. Morphet and Erick L. Lindman, Public School Finance
Programs of the Forty-eight States (Washington, D. C.: Federal
Security Agency, Office of Education, Government Printing Office, 1950).

[15]School Finance Series (Washington, D. C.: American Associa-
tion of School Administrators, National Education Association, 1956).

of educational load which are described in <u>Florida Statutes</u>.[16] The two weighted measures of educational load in the Florida foundation program are: (1) the instruction unit, and (2) the transportation unit. The combination of the two weighted measures comprise a large proportion of total cost and should give a satisfactory approximation of educational load.

Local financial ability to support schools involves the local economic potential which can be used for school tax revenue. The Florida Citizens Tax Council[17] made a series of studies of taxation in Florida. Part of the research related tax revenue to aggregate personal income. The Florida Citizens Tax Council also made a seven-county analysis of property tax assessment. The Florida Railroad Assessment Board made a county-by-county analysis of the ratio of assessed valuation of property to true value.

The Committee of Tax Education and School Finance[18] made an analysis of new sources of local school revenue. The committee found that approximately 2.1 per cent of local school tax revenue was derived from non-property taxes. The importance of non-property taxes appears

---

[16]Florida, <u>Revised Statutes</u> (1957), sec. 236.04 and sec. 236.05.

[17]<u>Summary of Studies of the Florida Citizens Tax Council, 1956-57</u> (Tallahassee: Bureau of Government Research and Service, School of Public Administration, Florida State University, 1958), pp. 6-11.

[18]<u>New Sources of Local Revenue for Public Schools</u> (Committee on Tax Education and School Finance, National Education Association, 1950), p. 14.

rather limited however in a more recent publication of the Committee
on Tax Education and School Finance the following was reported:

> Increased interest in broadening the taxing power at the
> local level: (a) Several states (New York, Ohio, Penn-
> sylvania, and West Virginia) are experimenting with local
> non-property taxes. However, some authorities maintain
> that governmental units smaller than a state generally,
> cannot administer non-property taxes effectively or
> efficiently. To overcome some of the difficulties, a
> few states have provided for the state collection of
> certain locally imposed non-property taxes. (b) Some
> states are granting substantial aid through foundation
> programs to the able districts as well as the less able—
> a means for reaching local non-property resources through
> the state authority to tax.[19]

Florida grants substantial aid through the state foundation program
to the able districts as well as to the less able districts. Local
non-property resources are reached through the state authority to
tax.

The importance of the property tax as a means for local sup-
port has lead to numerous studies of property tax administration,
with special emphasis on property assessment. The problem of assess-
ment has been summarized as follows:

> The hope for preserving the property tax which produces
> some $12 billion annually lies in (a) legal reform within
> which is not mere tinkering around with basic inequities
> to satisfy political pressures from special interest groups,
> and (b) sound administrative reform. It is estimated that
> the property tax revenues could be increased at least three-
> fold at the present level of tax rates if the assessment of
> the base truly measured the current value of taxable real
> property.[20]

---

[19]Guides to the Improvement of the State School Finance Programs
(Washington, D. C.: Committee on Tax Education and School Finance,
National Education Association, 1958), p. 25.

[20]Equalization of Property Assessments (Washington, D. C.: Com-
mittee on Tax Education and School Finance, 1958), p. 30.

The problem of measuring local taxpaying ability in relation to the assessed valuation of property has led to several methods for estimating a reasonable level of assessed valuation. Four methods are currently used for estimating local taxpaying ability:

1. Many states accept the results of local assessments made under little or no supervision. This results in conflicting pressures upon local assessors with respect to their assessments. Such pressures, if continued without state supervision, cannot work fairly over any length of time. The use of the uniform tax rate when assessment ratios vary is so obviously inequitable that it is no longer defensible.

2. Some states set standards and give some supervision to local assessors. This plan usually has more change of success than the first one, but it has not been altogether successful because of the limited supervision provided.

3. Other states require their state tax commissions to arrive at a ratio of assessed to true value of property in each taxpaying jurisdiction in the state. The department of education or other state agency is then required to use these ratios to compute equalized valuations in determining aid for all local school districts. The local district then finds it necessary to levy whatever rate on the assessed valuation that will produce taxes equal to the proceeds calculated on the equalized valuation. When the tax commission is well staffed and competent, this plan is highly promising.

4. Still other states use indexes of economic ability based upon retail sales, motor vehicle registrations, postal receipts, and other items. The indexes used in some states have been developed through the use of research techniques and are much more effective than those that have not been properly developed. Florida and Tennessee are two examples of states using developed indexes.[21]

---

[21]*Guides to the Improvement of State School Finance Programs*, op. cit., pp. 22-23.

Yett[22] reviewed over 35 studies relating to the measurement of local fiscal capacity starting with Cubberly[23] in 1905 and ending with Simpson,[24] and Garner[25] in 1956. In general the indices were described under two broad categories: scaling indices and regression indices. Yett describes a scaling index as follows:

> The scaling index is a comparison of units within a defined group by means of some generally acceptable criterion measure. The criterion measure is demonstrated by rational analysis to relate directly to (1) the possession or control of wealth, or (2) the authority to divert resources from private to public expenditures. The per capita income received may be used as the criterion measure for fiscal capacity. The authorized base for tax levies might be proposed. One of the most important limitations to this method of indexing has been the lack of reported data which are reliable or valid measure of the criterion.[26]

Problems in finding a criterion that is available for a long period of time and sensitive to short period influences without being subject to undesirable distortions led to the development of regression indices. Regression indices are defined as follows:

---

[22]Frank A. Yett, "The Determination of Structural Pattern in Population of Comparable Governmental or Demographic Units," unpublished Doctoral dissertation, University of California, 1957,

[23]Elwood P. Cubberly, State School Funds and Their Apportionment. (New York: Teachers College, Columbia University, 1950).

[24]Edgar R. Simpson, "The Validation of the Texas Economic Index," unpublished Doctoral dissertation, North Texas State College.

[25]Curtis R. Garner, "A Study to Determine the Validity of the Uniform Assessment Assumption Implied in the Use of Certain Measures of Local Taxpaying Ability in Arkansas," unpublished Doctoral dissertation, North Texas State College, 1956).

[26]Yett, op. cit., p. 51.

Regression indexes are those which use some mathematical function, usually a linear expression combining several related indexes. The expressions are intended to predict the value of the criterion index of the relative fiscal capacity of individual units within a defined group.[27]

Florida is one of the states that use an index of taxpaying ability based upon a regression formula. Johns and Meyer[28] have described the basic assumptions in and technique for development of the Florida index of taxpaying ability.

Cornell and his associates[29] found more accurate studies of relative taxpaying ability could be made if pupil units were adjusted by weighting for variables that affect per pupil cost. Mort and Reusser suggest "the fairest index of ability is the amount of taxable property, fairly assessed, back of each weighted-pupil unit."[30]

The measurement of local tax effort involves three major considerations: (1) the available "flow of money" in the tax jurisdiction, (2) the legal power to tax within the jurisdiction, and (3) the willingness of the constituents to assume the tax burden. Myers[31] calculated local effort as a ratio of local school tax revenue

[27]Ibid., p. 51.

[28]Roe L. Johns and Herbert A. Meyer, "A Method for Calculating an Economic Index of the Taxpaying Ability of Local School Units" (Gainesville: College of Education, University of Florida, 1954).

[29]Francis G. Cornell and others, Financing Education in Efficient School Districts (Champaign: Bureau of Research and Service, College of Education, University of Illinois, 1949).

[30]Paul R. Mort and Walter C. Reusser, Public School Finance (second edition: New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc., 1951), p. 509.

[31]Herman C. Myers, "A Study of Certain Phases of Local Tax Effort in Relation to Taxpaying Ability in Florida," unpublished Master's thesis, University of Florida, 1950.

to equalized assessed valuation of non-exempt property. The tax
effort represented the tax levy required to raise local school tax
revenue. The tax base was the assessed valuation of property with
adjustment for variation in assessment ratio by use of the index
of taxpaying ability.[32] Mort and Reusser conclude "the fairest
measure of local tax effort . . . is the tax rate computed by
dividing the amount of money actually raised for education by the
amount of taxable property fairly assessed."[33]

Local tax initiative has need of precise definition.[34]
In much of the literature the terms local tax effort and local tax
initiative are used interchangeably. The precise connotation of
local tax initiative in this study is as follows: that local tax
effort exerted beyond the required local contribution for participa-
tion in the state foundation program. The measure of local initiative

---

[32]The effort measured by Meyers represents the tax levy made
specifically for local support for schools. There is another type
of tax effort in state administered taxes paid to the state general
fund. The portion of state administered taxes collected locally
represents a type of non-property tax effort. The complexity of
approximating non-property school tax effort represents a challenge
to researchers in the field of economics and public finance.

[33]Mort and Reusser, op. cit., p. 509.

[34]Local financial initiative as defined in this study is not
to be confused with the broad concept of local initiative as defined
by Mort and Cornell in Adaptability of Public School Systems. The
Mort and Cornell study uses local initiative in relation to a broad
spectrum of organizational patterns. See: Paul R. Mort and Francis
G. Cornell. Adaptability of Public School Systems (New York:
Bureau of Publications, Teachers College, Columbia University, 1938),
pp. 91-141.

is a derivative of local tax effort. McClure[35] presented a graphic illustration of the present definition of local initiative in the study of the Illinois Foundation Program.

Sociological Description Studies

Researchers are frequently confronted with the problem of measuring the social, economic, political, and even psychological characteristics of a given region or area. The specific measures may emerge as a social climate scale, socio-economic index, planes of living scale, social class structure, scale of norms, and a variety of other indices. The general purpose of such studies is to establish a basis for comparing defined political or sociological units. Analyses of sociological description can be classified according to size. The Odum[35] study was a social, political, economic, and geographic inventory of individual states clustered about a geographical region of the United States. The analyses involved the findings of certain homogenity in selected measures that exist in a defined political subdivision. Bogue[37] made a study of counties in order to produce a functional grouping of related areas. Duncan and Reiss[38]

[35]William P. McClure, An Analysis of the Illinois Foundation Program of Public School Support (Urbana: Bureau of Research and Service, College of Education, University of Illinois, 1952).

[36]Howard W. Odum, Southern Regions of the United States (Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, 1936).

[37]Donald J. Bogue, State Economic Areas (Washington, D. C.: U. S. Bureau of the Census, Government Printing Office, 1951).

[38]Otis D. Duncan and Albert J. Reiss, Jr., Social Characteristics of Urban and Rural Communities, 1950 (New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc., 1956).

studied the sociological characteristics of urban and rural communities. Ogburn[39] studied cities when grouped according to size. Each of these analyses found a degree of homogeneity in sociological characteristics for areas of specified size. Size was not considered the sole determinant of sociological characteristics but better comparison between areas appeared to result when the areas were similar in size.

Sociological description of an individual community or sectors within a community frequently involve an analysis of social class structure, folkways, mores, and related factors. Research involving sociological factors within a community are exemplified by Lynd and Lynd,[40] Hollingshead,[41] and by Warner and Lunt.[42] Sociological description of defined qualities in a community are exemplified by Thorndike,[43] and by Thorndike and Woodyard.[44]

---

[39]William F. Ogburn, Social Characteristics of Cities (Chicago: International City Managers' Association, 1937).

[40]Robert S. Lynd and Helen M. Lynd, Middletown (New York: Harcourt, Brace and Company, 1929).

[41]August B. Hollingshead, Elmtown's Youth (New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc., 1949).

[42]W. Lloyd Warner and Paul S. Lunt, The Social Life of a Modern Community (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1949).

[43]Edward L. Thorndike, Your City (New York: Harcourt, Brace and Company, 1939).

[44]Edward L. Thorndike and Ella Woodyard, "The Relation Between the Aesthetic Status of a Community and Its Status in Other Respects," American Journal of Sociology, Vol. XLIX, No. 1 (July, 1943), p. 59.

Yett reviewed a series of analyses related to sociological characteristics and socio-economic status of communities and came to the following conclusion:

> One of the most impressive findings of socio-economic studies has been the clear demonstration of the inter-relationships of measurable characteristics of populations within defined areas.[45]

The socio-economic studies reviewed by Yett made extensive use of census data and data gathered from other governmental agencies. The number of factors included in the several measures of socio-economic status showed wide variation; Odum used 685 indices, Bogue used 88 non-agricultural and 78 agricultural indices, while Duncan and Reiss used two indices. Yett categorized the usual variables found in socio-economic measures as follows:

1. Estimates of physical wealth
2. Estimates of economic activity
3. Estimates of population characteristics
4. Estimates of political and social and cultural characteristics of the unit
5. Estimates of the technological characteristics of the unit[46]

Evidence seems to indicate that the socio-economic level of a political unit the size of a county can be approximated. The usual method is by statistical combination of selected variables drawn from quantified data prepared by official or semi-official agencies.

Studies Relating the Sociological Characteristics of an Area to School Finance

Very little research has been done in the area of relating sociological description to financial effort in the support of schools.

---

[45]Yett, op. cit., p. 47.

[46]Ibid., p. 50.

Pierce made an analysis of controllable community characteristics related to the quality of education. Pierce found close relationship between the quality of a community and the adaptability of its schools. "Good schools are likely to be found in good communities and less desirable communities are likely to have poorer schools."[47] The inference would appear that a "good community" would likewise have a high socio-economic or social climate status. The similarity is indicated by the fact that the variables used by Pierce are likewise used in many of the socio-economic measures.

Research in cost-quality relationship in school finance indicate the quality of a school is in part dependent upon the level of financial support. Mort reviewed 39 pieces of research in the area of cost-quality relationship and came to the following conclusion:

> These data would seem to indicate that even if the community factor were considered an entirely independent causative factor, which it certainly is not, or if it were denied that the community influence in considerable degree works through expenditures, the relationships that appear in the normative studies between expenditure level and quality would be strong.[48]

If good schools tend to be found in good communities and good schools in part result from greater expenditure, the analogy would tend to indicate communities with higher socio-economic status or social climate would make greater local initiative toward the support of schools.

---

[47]Truman M. Pierce, _Controllable Community Characteristics Related to the Quality of Education_ (New York: Bureau of Publications, Teachers College, Columbia University, 1947), p. 12.

[48]National Conference of Professors of Educational Administration, _op. cit._, p. 49.

There is little research relating social climate to local initiative and financial ability. There is even less research relating social climate to local initiative and financial ability in a state school system which has a foundation program.

CHAPTER III

LOCAL ABILITY TO SUPPORT EDUCATION

Education in the early period of American history was pri-
marily a local concern. The social and economic conditions of the
newly-formed nation were complementary to almost complete local
support and control of education.

Education today is a function of the state. In legal theory
the public school is a state institution. The responsibility for
financial support of education until recent decades has been largely
delegated to the local school district. The industrialization of
America with the resultant changes in economic structure and social
organization rendered many local school districts incapable of
complete local support for education. The geographical distribution
of population and the geographical distribution of financial ability
have not been identical. Local school districts continue to rely
mainly on the local property tax as a means for local support. The
distribution of economic potential is not altogether reflected in
property subject to taxation. The resultant has been to render a
large number of school districts incapable of adequate support for
schools. One partial remedy for lack of financial ability to support
schools has been through financial supplements from state government.
Several states have adopted state foundation programs with the state

46

assuming full responsibility for financial support or with a state-local plan of support based upon some measure of local ability. The Florida foundation program is based upon a measure of need. The Florida foundation program is calculated as follows: (1) the total cost of the acceptable minimum program is calculated, (2) the county required portion of the total cost is measured in terms of ability to pay, and (3) the remainder of the cost is allocated to the county from state funds. It is the purpose in this chapter to measure the relative ability to support education for the several counties in Florida.

The Tax Structure in Florida

The over-all tax structure of a state is an important consideration in measuring local taxpaying ability of the several counties. To consider a single tax in isolation ignores the incidence of the combined tax load. The Florida Citizens Tax Council in the study "Summary of Studies of the Florida Citizens Tax Council, 1956-57"[1] made an analysis of the over-all tax burden when the Florida counties were distributed into seven categories according to personal income per capita. Table 7 shows state and local revenues as a per cent of personal income in groups of Florida counties when distributed into seven categories according to personal income per capita. These data indicate the following:

---

[1]Summary of Studies of the Florida Citizens Tax Council, 1956-57 (Tallahassee: Bureau of Government Research and Service, School of Public Administration, Florida State University, 1958).

TABLE 7

STATE AND LOCAL REVENUES AS A PER CENT OF AGGREGATE PERSONAL INCOME IN COUNTIES WITH COUNTIES GROUPED ACCORDING TO LEVELS OF PER CAPITA PERSONAL INCOME FOR 1955

Revenue	Entire State	In Counties Grouped According to Personal Per Capita Income						
		$500 $700	$700 $900	$900 $1,100	$1,100 $1,300	$1,300 $1,500	$1,500[a] $1,800	Over $1,800
		Revenue as a Per Cent of Aggregate Personal Income						
Total Revenue	10.9%	11.9%	10.6%	10.9%	10.6%	11.5%	9.1%	12.1%
State tax revenue	5.4	7.5	6.6	5.7	5.5	5.7	4.5	5.9
Locally raised revenue[b]	5.5	4.4	4.0	5.3	5.1	5.9	4.7	6.5
Specific Taxes								
Highway-user charges[c]	2.2	5.4	4.6	3.2	2.9	2.3	1.9	1.8
General sales taxes	1.4	.7	.7	1.0	1.1	1.4	1.2	1.6
Other state taxes	1.8	1.4	1.2	1.4	1.5	2.0	1.4	2.5
Local property taxes	3.4	2.8	2.5	3.1	3.2	3.5	2.8	4.3
Number of counties	67	9	13	8	14	16	5	2

Source: Summary of Studies of the Florida Citizens Tax Council, 1956-57 (Tallahassee: Bureau of Government Research and Service, School of Public Administration, Florida State University, 1958), p. 9.

[a] The five counties with personal income per capita from $1,500 to $1,800 tend to defy the ratio trends which develop among the counties when grouped into seven categories according to personal income

TABLE 7—Continued

per capita.

[b]In addition to this source, the state distributes a certain amount to each county.

[c]Consists of gasoline and motor fuel taxes, motor vehicle licenses, and gasoline inspection fees.

1. Local and state revenue

   a. State tax revenue, as a per cent of personal income, tended to present an inverse relationship with income per capita. There was a trend toward a decrease in the ratio of state tax payments to personal income as income per capita increased.

   b. Locally raised revenue, as a per cent of personal income, tended to present a direct relationship with personal income per capita. There was a trend toward an increase in the ratio of locally raised revenue to personal income as personal income per capita increased.

   c. The combination of state tax revenue and locally raised revenue, as a per cent of personal income, tended to present a degree of similarity regardless of the level of personal income per capita. When the Florida counties were grouped into seven categories according to personal income per capita the ratio of state tax revenue and locally raised revenue to personal income shows limited variation.

2. Specific taxes

   a. The highway-user charges, as a per cent of personal income, tended to present an inverse relationship with personal income per capita. There was a trend

toward a decrease in the ratio of highway-user
charges to personal income as personal income
per capita increased.

b. The general sales taxes, as a per cent of personal
income, tended to present a direct relationship
with personal income per capita. There was a trend
toward an increase in the ratio of general sales
taxes to personal income as personal income per
capita increased.

c. Other state taxes, as a per cent of personal
income, tended to present a direct relationship
with personal income per capita. There was a
trend toward an increase in the ratio of other
state taxes to personal income as personal income
per capita increased.

d. Local property taxes, as a per cent of personal
income, tended to present a direct relationship
with personal income per capita. There was a
trend toward an increase in the ratio of local
property taxes to personal income as personal
income per capita increased.

The Tax Council gave the following interpretation of the data presented
in Table 7:

Net total revenue was generally distributed proportionately
to the variations in local ability so that rich and poor counties
paid, within a range, similar percentages of their personal in-
come to state and local treasuries. Credible as was this record,

individual county departures from this conclusion revealed disparities in tax loads. Especially was this true when the shifting of tourist-paid taxes is considered in a high-ability counties: after this tax shifting, the revenue loads were often less in relation to personal income of high-ability counties than of low ability ones. The reason total state and local revenue was generally proportionate to variations in local ability was twofold. First, as economic ability shrank among counties from high to low tax capacity, state tax payments decreased and property taxes and other local revenue declined in keeping with the restriction of the economic base. Second, the distribution of state aid to localities, especially to schools, permitted the maintenance of services whose costs would have been prohibitive without the aid.[2]

The Tax Council study actually showed that a degree of regression exists in the tax structure. The "credibility" of a similar ratio of tax payments to personal income at the several levels of personal income per capita assumes that regardless of the level of personal income per capita a similar per cent of the personal income is justified for tax payments. Are counties with personal income per capita of $700 and $1,800 equally capable of paying 11 per cent of personal income in tax payments? If Federal government tax payments were available and included in the analysis the findings would probably be greatly changed.

The Property Tax in Florida

The property tax is almost the sole source of local revenue for support of education in Florida. Local ability to support education is directly related to the assessed valuation of property. Florida Statutes define property subject to taxation as:

---

[2]Ibid., p. 10.

Unless expressly exempted from taxation, all real and personal property in this state, and all personal property belonging to persons residing in this state, shall be subject to taxation in the manner provided by law.[3]

Property subject to taxation falls into three categories: (1) real property, (2) tangible personal property, and (3) intangible personal property. Real property is defined:

For purposes of taxation "real property" shall be construed to include lands and all buildings, fixtures and other improvements thereon. When used in connection with taxation the terms "land" and "real estate" shall be construed as having the same meaning as real property above defined.[4]

Tangible personal property is defined:

For purposes of taxation "personal property" shall be construed to include all goods and chattels, money and effects, boats and vessels, debts due or to become due from solvent debtors whether on account, contract, note or otherwise, and all public stock or shares in incorporated, or unincorporated companies.[5]

Intangible personal property is defined:

"Intangible personal property" is hereby defined as all personal property which is not in itself intrinsically valuable but which derives its chief value from what it represents. "Taxpayer" shall mean a person, firm or corporation who or which shall be liable for taxes under this chapter for intangible personal property.[6]

Intangible personal property taxes are earmarked for city government employee retirement funds with the unused balance reverting to the general fund of the state. Since intangible property tax does not

---

[3]Florida, Revised Statutes (1957), sec. 192.01.

[4]Ibid., sec. 192.02.

[5]Ibid., sec. 192.03.

[6]Ibid., sec. 199.01.

contribute toward local support of education the intangible personal
property tax will not be considered a part of the present analysis.

The Florida State Comptroller[7] reports county tax assessment
rolls in the following twelve categories:

1. Assessed value non-exempt real estate
2. Assessed value personal property
3. Assessed value railroad and telegraph property
4. All non-exempt property
5. Total homestead exemptions
6. Total value for interest and sinking fund
7. Valuation of lands wholly exempt
8. Value of lands to trustees internal improvement fund
9. Value delinquent homesteads
10. Value delinquent non-exempt property
11. Total other valuation
12. Total value all property in county

The twelve categories for reporting assessed valuation of county
property conform to the classifications of property for taxing
purposes and/or exemption from taxes.

All real and personal property in Florida is taxable unless
expressly exempted. Exemption is based upon: (1) ownership, (2) use,
and (3) because of other taxes. Specific exemptions are as follows:

1. Exempt because of ownership

   a. disabled veteran (up to $500 value)
   b. widow (up to $500 value)
   c. disabled person (up to $500 value)
   d. head of family ($1,000 on household goods or personal)
   e. state
   f. United States
   g. banks (except real estate)

---

[7]Report of the Comptroller of the State of Florida (Tallahassee:
Office of Comptroller, 1951), pp. 54-55.

2. Exempt because of use

    a. municipal or other public purposes
    b. religious purposes
    c. benevolent, fraternal, and charitable purposes
    d. veterans' purposes
    e. educational, scientific, and literary purposes
    f. agricultural society purposes
    g. homestead purposes (up to $5,000 value) depends
       on ownership

3. Exempt because of other taxes

    a. automobiles
    b. airplanes
    c. semi-trailers

Homestead exemptions have the greatest weight in narrowing the property tax base in Florida. Table 8 shows the assessed valuation of non-exempt property and homestead exempt property for selected years. These data indicate an increase of 87.92 per cent in total assessed valuation of property between the years 1951 and 1957. The average yearly increase in total assessed valuation of property was 14.65 per cent. The assessed valuation of non-exempt property increased 81.11 per cent between the years 1951 and 1957. The average yearly increase in assessed valuation of non-exempt property was 13.52 per cent. The assessed valuation of homestead exempt property increased 103.09 per cent between the years 1951 and 1957. The average yearly increase in the assessed valuation of homestead exempt property was 17.82 per cent.

Table 9 shows the per cent of total assessed valuation of property in non-exempt property and homestead exempt property for selected years. These data indicate a trend toward an increase in the per cent of property valuation classified as homestead exempt. About

TABLE 8

ASSESSED VALUATION OF NON-EXEMPT AND HOMESTEAD EXEMPT PROPERTY IN
FLORIDA FOR SELECTED YEARS

Year	Non-Exempt Property	Homestead Exempt Property	Total Assessed Valuation
1951	$3,004,337,847	$1,348,031,989	$4,352,369,836
1952	3,215,249,690	1,488,251,996	4,703,501,686
1953	3,509,263,302	1,651,228,890	5,160,492,192
1954	3,766,509,605	1,844,331,706	5,610,841,311
1955	4,026,017,000	2,071,427,792	6,097,444,966
1956	4,529,974,763	2,327,636,428	6,857,611,191
1957	5,441,079,336	2,737,767,843	8,178,847,179
Six-year increase	$2,436,741,489	$1,389,735,854	$3,826,477,343
Average yearly increases	$ 406,123,582	$ 231,622,642	$ 637,746,224
Per cent increase six years	81.11%	103.09%	87.92%
Per cent yearly increase	13.52%	17.82%	14.65%

Source: Report of the Comptroller of the State of Florida
(Tallahassee: Office of Comptroller): 1951, pp. 54-55; 1952, pp. 54-55;
1953, pp. 66-67; 1954, pp. 66-67; 1955, pp. 66-67; 1956, pp. 66-67; 1957,
pp. 66-67.

TABLE 9

NON-EXEMPT AND HOMESTEAD EXEMPT ASSESSED VALUATION
AS A PER CENT OF THE AGGREGATE FOR SELECTED YEARS

Year	Non-Exempt Property	Homestead Exempt	Total Assessed Valuation
1951	69.03%	30.97%	100.00%
1952	68.36	31.64	100.00
1953	68.00	32.00	100.00
1954	67.13	32.87	100.00
1955	66.03	33.97	100.00
1956	66.06	33.94	100.00
1957	66.53	33.47	100.00

aDerived from data presented in Table 8.

one-third of the assessed valuation of property is classified as home-
stead exempt property and is in general not subject to taxation. The
improvement of real property by the construction of homes generally
has the paradoxical effect of lowering the assessed valuation of the
same property for purposes of taxation.

Table 10 shows the assessed valuation of the several classes
of non-exempt property for selected years. These data indicate an
increase of 81.11 per cent in total assessed valuation of non-exempt
property for a six-year period. The average yearly increase in total
assessed valuation of non-exempt property was 13.52 per cent. The
assessed valuation of real property increased 93.07 per cent between
the years 1951 and 1957. The average yearly increase in assessed

TABLE 10

ASSESSED VALUATION OF NON-EXEMPT PROPERTY, BY CLASS, IN FLORIDA FOR SELECTED YEARS

Year	Real Estate	Personal Property	Railroad and Telegraph	Total Assessed Valuation of Non-Exempt Property
1951	$2,217,701,941	$ 668,821,463	$ 117,814,443	$3,004,337,847
1952	2,383,435,057	712,741,324	119,073,309	3,215,249,690
1953	2,497,746,339	776,284,154	135,232,800	3,509,263,302
1954	2,799,783,763	831,303,561	135,422,281	3,766,509,605
1955	3,004,409,000	887,362,000	134,251,000	4,026,017,000
1956	3,489,750,626	906,056,055	134,168,082	4,529,974,763
1957	4,281,096,943	1,031,410,000	128,572,393	5,441,079,336
Six-year increase	$2,063,395,002	$ 362,588,537	$ 10,757,950	$2,436,741,489
Average yearly increase	$ 343,899,166	$ 60,431,422	$ 1,792,991	$ 406,123,583
Per cent increase six years	93.07%	54.21%	9.13%	81.11%
Per cent yearly increase	15.51%	9.04%	1.52%	13.52%

Source: Report of Comptroller of the State of Florida (Tallahassee: Office of Comptroller, 1955), pp. 66-67.

valuation of real property was 15.51 per cent. The assessed valuation of personal property increased 54.21 per cent between the years 1951 and 1957. The average yearly increase in assessed valuation of personal property was 9.04 per cent. The assessed valuation of railroad and telegraph property increased 9.13 per cent between the years 1951 and 1957. The average yearly increase in assessed valuation of railroad and telegraph property was 1.52 per cent.

Table 11 shows the per cent of total assessed valuation of non-exempt property in real property, personal property, and railroad and telegraph property for selected years. The data indicate a trend toward an increase in the per cent of total assessed valuation of non-exempt property borne by real property. Personal property and railroad and telegraph property indicate a decrease in per cent of total assessed valuation of non-exempt property. Real property is progressively assuming a greater share of the assessed valuation of non-exempt property, however, data presented in Table 9 indicates a progressive increase in property classified as homestead exempt. The two developing trends lead to the conclusion that a considerable portion of the assessed valuation of real property is being shifted to business property or at least property not included in homestead exemption.

Table 12 shows the per cent of total assessed valuation of property in the several classifications of property within the several counties in Florida for the year 1955. Data presented in Table 12 reveals only the per cent of total assessed valuation of property in the several classes of property in the several counties in Florida. These data are not an evaluation of assessment practice. Table 13

TABLE 11

ASSESSED VALUATION OF CLASSES OF NON-EXEMPT PROPERTY AS A
PER CENT OF THE AGGREGATE FOR SELECTED YEARS

Year	Real Estate	Personal Property	Railroad and Telegraph	Total Assessed Valuation of Non-Exempt Property
1951	73.82%	22.26%	3.92%	100.00%
1952	74.13	22.17	3.70	100.00
1953	74.03	22.12	3.85	100.00
1954	74.33	22.07	3.60	100.00
1955	74.60	22.00	3.40	100.00
1956	77.04	20.00	2.96	100.00
1957	78.68	18.96	2.36	100.00

Derived from data presented in Table 10.

TABLE 12

PERCENTAGE DISTRIBUTION OF ASSESSED VALUATION OF PROPERTY, BY CLASS, IN FLORIDA COUNTIES FOR THE YEAR 1955

County	Non-Exempt and Homestead Exempt Property			Non-Exempt Property			
	Non-Exempt	Homestead Exempt	Total	Real Estate	Personal Property	Railroad and Telegraph Property	Total
Alachua	66.8%	33.2%	100.0%	64.9%	25.2%	9.9%	100.0%
Baker	81.6	18.4	100.0	53.5	9.8	36.7	100.0
Bay	61.7	38.3	100.0	61.1	36.2	2.7	100.0
Bradford	64.9	35.1	100.0	54.6	27.1	18.3	100.0
Brevard	62.2	37.8	100.0	66.6	21.8	11.6	100.0
Broward	71.0	29.0	100.0	84.8	14.6	.6	100.0
Calhoun	68.7	31.3	100.0	70.5	28.6	.9	100.0
Charlotte	76.1	23.9	100.0	64.0	22.3	13.7	100.0
Citrus	69.0	31.0	100.0	56.6	21.7	21.7	100.0
Clay	61.3	38.7	100.0	71.4	18.6	10.0	100.0
Collier	87.2	12.8	100.0	84.4	10.1	5.5	100.0
Columbia	56.0	44.0	100.0	65.8	23.8	10.4	100.0
Dade	69.3	30.7	100.0	79.6	19.9	.5	100.0
DeSoto	71.5	28.5	100.0	55.7	20.0	24.3	100.0
Dixie	85.8	14.2	100.0	80.2	10.6	9.2	100.0
Duval	62.5	37.5	100.0	66.8	28.1	5.1	100.0
Escambia	62.4	37.6	100.0	57.7	36.3	6.0	100.0
Flagler	84.0	16.0	100.0	47.8	27.5	24.7	100.0
Franklin	79.0	21.0	100.0	76.9	16.3	6.8	100.0
Gadsden	59.4	40.6	100.0	63.0	25.2	11.8	100.0

TABLE 12—Continued

County	Non-Exempt and Homestead Exempt Property			Non-Exempt Property			
	Non-Exempt	Homestead Exempt	Total	Real Estate	Personal Property	Railroad and Telegraph Property	Total
Gilchrist	80.3%	19.7%	100.0%	53.9%	18.4	27.7%	100.0%
Glades	88.2	11.8	100.0	52.1	23.9	24.0	100.0
Gulf	81.7	18.3	100.0	38.2	58.9	2.9	100.0
Hamilton	80.6	19.4	100.0	57.4	30.0	12.6	100.0
Hardee	69.7	30.3	100.0	64.5	19.9	15.6	100.0
Hendry	81.1	18.9	100.0	61.6	33.7	4.7	100.0
Hernando	68.9	31.1	100.0	57.4	23.4	19.2	100.0
Highlands	75.4	24.6	100.0	65.9	23.0	11.1	100.0
Hillsborough	60.2	39.8	100.0	69.2	27.8	3.0	100.0
Holmes	53.8	46.2	100.0	46.2	40.6	13.2	100.0
Indian River	70.8	29.2	100.0	76.1	19.2	4.7	100.0
Jackson	79.2a	20.8a	100.0	48.0	38.4	13.6	100.0
Jefferson	84.0	16.0	100.0	63.3	19.6	17.1	100.0
Lafayette	78.9	21.1	100.0	71.9	23.8	4.3	100.0
Lake	68.8	31.2	100.0	78.9	14.8	6.3	100.0
Lee	60.4	39.6	100.0	75.8	20.0	4.2	100.0
Leon	64.2	35.8	100.0	75.5	22.1	2.4	100.0
Levy	80.6	19.4	100.0	47.6	32.5	19.9	100.0
Liberty	74.5	25.5	100.0	65.6	5.7	28.7	100.0
Madison	66.7	33.3	100.0	66.5	17.1	16.4	100.0

aBased on 1957 tax roll, not reported for the years 1954, 1955, and 1956.

TABLE 12—Continued

County	Non-Exempt and Homestead Exempt Property			Non-Exempt Property			
	Non-Exempt	Homestead Exempt	Total	Real Estate	Personal Property	Railroad and Telegraph Property	Total
Manatee	49.6%	50.4%	100.0%	82.7%	13.9%	3.4%	100.0%
Marion	65.2	34.8	100.0	63.7	26.2	10.1	100.0
Martin	77.6	22.4	100.0	70.7	17.2	12.1	100.0
Monroe	77.5	22.5	100.0	79.5	20.2	.3	100.0
Nassau	78.5	21.5	100.0	40.2	40.8	19.0	100.0
Okaloosa	58.4	41.6	100.0	55.6	33.7	10.7	100.0
Okeechobee	84.5	15.5	100.0	62.8	19.7	17.5	100.0
Orange	59.4	40.6	100.0	72.0	26.2	1.8	100.0
Osceola	66.4	33.6	100.0	69.5	26.8	3.7	100.0
Palm Beach	67.8	32.2	100.0	74.3	23.2	2.5	100.0
Pasco	64.6	35.4	100.0	66.4	16.4	17.2	100.0
Pinellas	61.2	38.8	100.0	88.0	11.4	.6	100.0
Polk	70.5	29.5	100.0	60.5	34.4	5.1	100.0
Putnam	71.0	29.0	100.0	54.6	38.1	7.3	100.0
St. Johns	65.0	35.0	100.0	62.2	20.9	16.9	100.0
St. Lucie	61.0	39.0	100.0	75.4	16.5	8.1	100.0
Santa Rosa	53.5	46.5	100.0	58.8	31.1	10.1	100.0
Sarasota	54.3	45.7	100.0	84.5	13.4	2.1	100.0
Seminole	66.6	33.4	100.0	62.4	30.8	6.8	100.0
Sumter	69.4	30.6	100.0	40.3	16.4	43.3	100.0

TABLE 12—Continued

County	Non-Exempt and Homestead Exempt Property			Non-Exempt Property			
	Non-Exempt	Homestead Exempt	Total	Real Estate	Personal Property	Railroad and Telegraph Property	Total
Suwannee	63.3%	36.7%	100.0%	45.5%	40.1%	14.4%	100.0%
Taylor	78.5	21.5	100.0	34.0	55.4	10.6	100.0
Union	87.0	13.0	100.0	35.8	20.8	43.4	100.0
Volusia	62.3	37.7	100.0	77.5	18.8	3.7	100.0
Wakulla	66.6	33.4	100.0	67.8	27.5	4.7	100.0
Walton	52.1	47.9	100.0	64.2	27.3	8.5	100.0
Washington	61.6	38.4	100.0	50.8	40.6	8.6	100.0
State	66.0	34.0	100.0	74.6	22.0	3.4	100.0

Source: Report of the Comptroller of the State of Florida (Tallahassee: Office of Comptroller, 1955), pp. 66-67.

shows the extent of variation in assessed valuation as revealed in Table 12.

TABLE 13

VARIATION IN DISTRIBUTION OF ASSESSED VALUATION OF PROPERTY, BY CLASS, IN FLORIDA COUNTIES FOR THE YEAR 1955

Variation	Non-Exempt and Homestead Exempt Property		Non-Exempt Property		
	Non-Exempt	Homestead Exempt	Real Estate	Personal Property	Railroad and Telegraph Property
High	87.2	50.4	88.0	58.9	43.4
Low	49.6	12.8	34.0	5.7	.3
Range	37.6	37.6	54.0	53.2	43.1
Average for state	66.0	34.0	74.6	22.0	3.4

Derived from data presented in Table 12.

The quality of assessment practice in Florida has been a subject of concern for many years. One of the more recent studies of assessment was a seven-county evaluation of assessment practice conducted by the Florida Citizen's Tax Council. The Florida Citizen's Tax Council arrived at the following conclusions:

1. None of the seven counties studied conformed even substantially, to the statutory requirement that all property be assessed at full cash value.
2. Average assessment ratios varied widely from county to county. As a result, the distribution of the general property tax among the various segments of the population is distorted, from one county to another. This result is further aggravated by the operation of the homestead exemption.

3. Within each of the counties studied, average assessment ratios varied widely from one class of property to another.

4. The limited data of the staff ratio study did not indicate any pattern of over or under-assessment of particular classes of property, from one county to another.

5. In general, property that was wholly or in part subject to homestead exemption was assessed at a higher percentage of full value than was non-exempt property. Lake, Leon, and Orange Counties were exception to this, however.

6. In each of the counties studied, the levels at which particular parcels were assessed varied widely within each of the several classes of property.

7. Not only did the levels of assessment vary widely within classes of property for individual counties, but the extent of the dispersion varied from one class of property to another as well as among the samples of the same classes of property in the several counties.

8. Certain classes of property were assessed more uniformly than were other classes, in most of the counties studied.

9. The foregoing generalizations might be characterized by the single phrase: "variation and discrimination instead of uniformity and equity."[8]

The Tax Council reported that:

1. Methods used for discovery and valuation of property varied widely from county to county. The need for more standardization of procedures is indispensible.

2. One effect of the homestead exemption is to increase the regressivity of the property tax.

3. A second major effect of the homestead exemption is to aggravate inequities in the administration of the property tax that are brought about in the first instance by imperfections in the assessing process.[9]

The Florida Railroad Assessment Board[10] conducted a county-by-county study of assessment ratios for the 1957 tax year. Results of

---

[8]*Summary of Studies of the Florida Citizens Tax Council,* 1956-1957, *op. cit.*, pp. 49-50.

[9]*Ibid.*, p. 50.

[10]"*Railroad* and Telegraph Valuation by Counties." Tallahassee: Florida Railroad Assessment Board, 1958, p. 1.

the study were applied in tax equity cases in compliance with the 1957 statutory enactment authorizing greater equity in the assessment of real property in relation to railroad and telegraph property. Table 14 shows the distribution of Florida counties in relation to the per cent the assessed valuation of property is to true value as determined by the Florida Railroad Assessment Board.

TABLE 14

DISTRIBUTION OF COUNTIES IN FLORIDA BY RATIO OF ASSESSED VALUATION OF PROPERTY TO TRUE VALUE OF PROPERTY FOR 1958

Per Cent Assessed Valuation Is of True Value	Number of Counties
80% - 100%	3
60 - 80	6
40 - 60	27
20 - 40	31
50% and over	15
Less than 50%	52

Source: "Railroad and Telegraph Valuation by Counties," Tallahassee: Florida Railroad Assessment Board, 1958, p. 2.

The study revealed a range of 74.39 per cent in the ratio of assessed valuation to "true" value. Fifty-two of the 67 counties in Florida have an assessed valuation which is less than 50 per cent of true cash value as reported by the Florida Railroad Assessment Board.

Property assessment is a locally controlled function in Florida. The people in the several counties through popular election of the county tax assessor and the county commissioners have a voice

in assessment practice. In a limited sense the level of property assessment conforms to the wishes of the people or at least the group which wins the elections. Both the Florida Citizen's Tax Council and the Florida Railroad Assessment Board studies indicate wide discrepancies in assessment practices in Florida.

Property assessment in Florida counties cannot be used as a valid measure of local taxpaying ability. Measures independent of assessment practice to be employed in order to approximate local taxpaying ability. The following discussion involves a series of analyses of selected elements relative to taxpaying ability.

Personal Income Per Capita as a Means of Studying Selected Elements of Local Taxpaying Ability

Personal income per capita represents resources available to individuals for subsistence, for purchasing goods and services above the level of subsistence, and for investments. Personal income per capita is a measure of taxpaying ability and can be used for analysis of other selected factors relative to taxpaying ability. Table 15 shows the distribution of Florida counties into eight categories according to personal income per capita. The Florida counties are distributed into eight categories according to income per capita with each category having a range of $200. Exception is made for the category "$2,000 and over" which includes two counties in which the personal income per capita is $2,125 in one and $3,149 in the other. Data on personal income per capita were obtained from a study by Kilpatrick.[11]

---

[11]Wylie Kilpatrick, "Personal Income Received in Florida Counties: 1956," Economic Leaflets, XXV, No. 4 (May, 1958), p. 2.

TABLE 15

DISTRIBUTION OF FLORIDA COUNTIES INTO EIGHT CATEGORIES ACCORDING TO
INCOME PER CAPITA

Personal Income Per Capita[a]	Counties
$2,000 and over	Dade, Hendry
$1,800 to $2,000	Brevard, Collier, Duval, Okaloosa, Palm Beach, Sarasota
$1,600 to $1,800	Bay, Broward, Escambia, Glades, Gulf, Highlands, Indian River, Lake, Martin, Monroe, Orange, Pinellas, Polk
$1,400 to $1,600	Charlotte, Flagler, Hillsborough, Lee, Leon, St. Lucie, Volusia
$1,200 to $1,400	Alachua, Clay, DeSoto, Gadsden, Hardee, Manatee, Marion, Nassau, Pasco, Putnam, St. Johns, Seminole, Taylor
$1,000 to $1,200	Columbia, Hernando, Jackson, Lafayette, Levy, Liberty, Okeechobee, Santa Rosa, Sumter, Suwannee
$ 800 to $1,000	Bradford, Citrus, Franklin, Gilchrist, Hamilton, Jefferson, Madison, Osceola, Walton, Washington
$ 600 to $ 800	Baker, Calhoun, Dixie, Holmes, Union, Wakulla

Source: Wylie Kilpatrick, "Personal Income Received in Florida
Counties: 1956," Economic Leaflets, XXV, No. 4 (May, 1958), p. 2.

[a]Income per capita rests upon two factors, population and the
amount of income. Income per capita in the Florida counties varied
from $629 to $3,149 for the year 1956.

The analysis which follows presents a series of factors
in quantified form as found in the Florida counties when the Florida
counties are distributed into eight categories according to personal
income per capita. The analysis is as follows: (1) relationship of
factors within each category of personal income per capita, and (2)
relationship of factors among the eight categories of personal income
per capita.

Relating Assessed Valuation of Property to Personal Income Per Capita

Table 16 shows the assessed valuation of non-exempt and home-
stead exempt property in the Florida counties when grouped into eight
categories according to personal income per capita. Table 17 shows
the assessed valuation of the several classes of non-exempt property
in the Florida counties when grouped into eight categories according
to personal income per capita. Table 18 shows the per cent of the
aggregate assessed valuation of property in non-exempt valuation and
homestead exempt valuation in each of the categories of personal
income per capita when the Florida counties are grouped according to
personal income per capita. The per cent of the aggregate assessed
valuation of property in homestead exempt property and in non-exempt
property, within a limited range, tends to remain about the same
regardless of personal income per capita. Within the limits of this
analysis the classification of property as non-exempt or homestead
exempt does not appear to be affected by variation in personal income
per capita.

TABLE 16

ASSESSED VALUATION OF PROPERTY IN FLORIDA COUNTIES GROUPED ACCORDING TO
INCOME PER CAPITA

Personal Income Per Capita[a]	Homestead Exempt Property	Non-Exempt Property	Total Assessed Valuation
$2,000 and over	$1,232,896,499	$ 543,611,470	$1,776,507,969
$1,800 to $2,000	589,028,055	333,040,765	922,068,820
$1,600 to $1,800	1,258,879,142	650,507,481	1,909,386,623
$1,400 to $1,600	521,048,000	326,692,869	847,740,869
$1,200 to $1,400	275,791,680	152,467,889	428,259,569
$1,000 to $1,200	68,542,970	29,356,182	97,899,152
$ 800 to $1,000	59,472,660	27,551,504	87,024,164
$ 600 to $ 800	20,358,168	8,199,632	28,557,800
Total	$4,026,017,174	$2,071,427,792	$6,097,444,966

Source: Report of the Comptroller of the State of Florida,
(Tallahassee: Office of Comptroller, 1955), pp. 66-67.

[a]For grouping of counties see Table 15.

TABLE 17

ASSESSED VALUATION OF NON-EXEMPT PROPERTY IN FLORIDA COUNTIES GROUPED ACCORDING TO INCOME PER CAPITA

Personal Income Per Capita[a]	Real Property	Personal Property	Railroad and Telegraph Property	Total Non-Exempt Assessed Valuation
$2,000 and over	$ 980,123,590	$246,164,800	$ 6,608,109	$1,232,896,499
$1,800 to $2,000	416,346,955	146,373,713	26,307,387	589,028,055
$1,600 to $1,800	972,716,858	255,869,442	30,292,842	1,258,879,142
$1,400 to $1,600	374,881,134	126,625,428	19,541,338	521,048,000
$1,200 to $1,400	173,307,917	73,556,561	28,927,202	275,791,680
$1,000 to $1,200	36,759,225	20,179,236	11,604,509	68,542,970
$ 800 to $1,000	37,527,410	14,118,601	7,826,649	59,472,660
$ 600 to $ 800	12,740,946	4,473,271	3,143,951	20,358,168
Total	3,004,404,035	887,361,152	134,251,987	4,026,017,174

Source: Report of the Comptroller of the State of Florida (Tallahassee: Office of Comptroller, 1955), pp. 66-67.

[a]For grouping of counties see Table 15.

TABLE 18

ASSESSED VALUATION OF NON-EXEMPT AND HOMESTEAD EXEMPT PROPERTY AS A
PER CENT OF THE AGGREGATE IN EACH OF THE CATEGORIES OF PERSONAL
INCOME PER CAPITA WHEN THE FLORIDA COUNTIES ARE GROUPED
ACCORDING TO PERSONAL INCOME PER CAPITA

Personal Income Per Capita[a]	Non-Exempt Property	Homestead Exempt Property	Total Assessed Valuation
$2,000 and over	60.40%	30.60%	100.00%
$1,800 to $2,000	63.88	36.12	100.00
$1,600 to $1,800	65.22	34.78	100.00
$1,400 to $1,600	61.46	38.54	100.00
$1,200 to $1,400	64.40	35.60	100.00
$1,000 to $1,200	70.01	29.00	100.00
$ 800 to $1,000	68.34	31.66	100.00
$ 600 to $ 800	71.29	28.71	100.00
State	66.03	33.97	100.00

Derived from data presented in Table 16.

[a]For grouping of counties see Table 15.

Table 19 shows the per cent of the aggregate assessed valuation of non-exempt property in the several classes of non-exempt property for each of the categories when the Florida counties are grouped according to personal income per capita. The per cent of the aggregate assessed valuation of non-exempt property in real property tends to increase as personal income per capita increases. The per cent of the aggregate assessed valuation of non-exempt property in railroad and telegraph property tends to decrease as personal income per capita increases. The per cent of the aggregate assessed valuation of non-exempt property in personal property, within a limited range, tends to remain relatively constant as personal income per capita increases. Within the limitations of this analysis the assessed valuation of non-exempt property classified as real property tends to show a direct relationship to personal income per capita. Within the limitations of this analysis the assessed valuation of non-exempt property classified as railroad and telegraph property tends to show an inverse relationship to personal income per capita. Within the limitations of this analysis the assessed valuation of non-exempt property classified as personal property, within a range, shows little relationship to personal income per capita.

Table 20 shows the assessed valuation of non-exempt property and homestead exempt property as a per cent of the aggregates among the eight groups of Florida counties classified according to personal income per capita. Approximately 75 per cent of the assessed valuation of property within the state is found in the 21 counties with personal income per capita of $1,600 and over. About 10 per cent

TABLE 19

CLASSES OF NON-EXEMPT PROPERTY AS A PER CENT OF THE AGGREGATE IN EACH OF THE CATEGORIES OF PERSONAL INCOME PER CAPITA WHEN THE FLORIDA COUNTIES ARE GROUPED ACCORDING TO PERSONAL INCOME PER CAPITA

Personal Income Per Capita[a]	Real Property	Personal Property	Railroad and Tele-graph Property	Assessed Valuation of Non-Exempt Property
$2,000 and over	79.50%	19.97%	.53%	100.00%
$1,800 to $2,000	70.68	24.85	4.47	100.00
$1,600 to $1,800	77.50	20.19	2.31	100.00
$1,400 to $1,600	71.95	24.30	3.75	100.00
$1,200 to $1,400	62.84	26.67	10.49	100.00
$1,000 to $1,200	53.63	29.44	16.93	100.00
$ 800 to $1,000	63.10	23.74	13.16	100.00
$ 600 to $ 800	62.58	21.97	15.45	100.00
State	74.64	22.05	3.31	100.00

Derived from data presented in Table 17.

[a]For grouping of counties see Table 15.

TABLE 20

ASSESSED VALUATION OF NON-EXEMPT PROPERTY AND HOMESTEAD EXEMPT PROPERTY
AS A PER CENT OF THE AGGREGATES AMONG THE CATEGORIES OF PERSONAL
INCOME PER CAPITA WHEN THE FLORIDA COUNTIES ARE GROUPED
ACCORDING TO PERSONAL INCOME PER CAPITA

Personal Income Per Capita	Non-Exempt Property	Homestead Exempt Property	Assessed Valuation of Property
$2,000 and over	30.62%	26.24%	29.14%
$1,800 to $2,000	14.63	16.08	15.12
$1,600 to $1,800	31.27	31.40	31.31
$1,400 to $1,600	12.94	15.77	13.90
$1,200 to $1,400	6.85	7.36	7.02
$1,000 to $1,200	1.70	1.42	1.61
$ 800 to $1,000	1.48	1.33	1.43
$ 600 to $ 800	.51	.40	.47
Total	100.00	100.00	100.00

Derived from data presented in Table 16

[a]For grouping of counties see Table 15.

of the assessed valuation of property in the state is found in the
39 counties with personal income per capita of $1,400 and below.
The distribution of the two classes of property in terms of assessed
valuation, within a limited range, shows a similar pattern of distribu-
tion. (The similarity in the pattern of distribution was indicated by
data presented in Table 18).

Table 21 shows the assessed valuation of the several classes
of non-exempt property as a per cent of the aggregates among the
eight groups of counties classified according to personal income per
capita. Approximately 79 per cent of the assessed valuation of real
property in the state is found in the 21 counties with personal income
per capita of $1,600 and over. Approximately 9 per cent of the assessed
valuation of real property in the state is found in the 39 counties with
personal income per capita of $1,400 and below. Approximately 67 per
cent of the assessed valuation of personal property is found in the 21
counties with personal income per capita of $1,600 and over. Approxi-
mately 13 per cent of the assessed valuation of personal property in
the state is found in the 21 counties with personal income per capita
of $1,400 and below. Approximately 13 per cent of the assessed valua-
tion of personal property in the state is found in the 21 counties with
personal income per capita of $1,400 and below. Approximately 47 per
cent of the assessed valuation of railroad and telegraph property is
found in the 21 counties with personal income per capita of $1,600 and
over. Approximately 38 per cent of the assessed valuation of railroad
and telegraph property is found in the 39 counties with personal income
per capita of $1,400 and below. The distribution of assessed valuation

TABLE 21

ASSESSED VALUATION OF THE SEVERAL CLASSES OF NON-EXEMPT PROPERTY AS A PER CENT OF THE
AGGREGATES AMONG THE CATEGORIES OF PERSONAL INCOME PER CAPITA WHEN THE FLORIDA
COUNTIES ARE GROUPED ACCORDING TO PERSONAL INCOME PER CAPITA

Personal Income Per Capita[a]	Real Property	Personal Property	Railroad and Tele- graph Property	Assessed Valuation of Non-Exempt Property
$2,000 and over	32.62%	27.74%	4.92%	30.62%
$1,800 to $2,000	13.86	16.50	19.60	14.63
$1,600 to $1,800	32.38	28.83	22.56	31.27
$1,400 to $1,600	12.48	14.27	14.56	12.94
$1,200 to $1,400	5.77	8.29	21.55	6.82
$1,000 to $1,200	1.22	2.28	8.64	1.70
$ 800 to $1,000	1.25	1.59	5.83	1.48
$ 600 to $ 800	.42	.50	2.34	.51
Total	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00

Derived from data presented in Table 17.

[a]For grouping of counties see Table 15.

of real property and the assessed valuation of personal property, within a limited range, are similar. The distribution of assessed valuation of railroad and telegraph property shows greater weight in the lower categories of personal income per capita than does either real property or personal property.

Relating Aggregate Personal Income and Population to Personal Income Per Capita

Personal income per capita is based upon two factors, aggregate personal income and population. Table 22 shows the distribution of aggregate personal income and population among the eight categories when the Florida counties are grouped according to personal income per capita. Table 23 shows aggregate personal income and population as a per cent of the aggregates among the eight categories of personal income per capita when the Florida counties are grouped according to personal income per capita. The two counties with personal income per capita of $2,000 and over have 19.73 per cent of the state population and 24.56 per cent of the aggregate personal income within the state. Counties with personal income per capita of $1,600 and over, approximately one-third of the counties in Florida, have 68 per cent of the state population and nearly 76 per cent of the aggregate personal income within the state. Counties with personal income per capita of $1,200 and less have 7.00 per cent of the state population and 3.82 per cent of the aggregate personal income within the state. These data indicate a tendency toward personal income and population to be concentrated in a limited number of counties. Two outstanding

TABLE 22

AGGREGATE PERSONAL INCOME AND POPULATION IN THE EIGHT CATEGORIES OF
PERSONAL INCOME PER CAPITA WHEN THE FLORIDA COUNTIES ARE GROUPED
ACCORDING TO PERSONAL INCOME PER CAPITA

Personal Income Per Capita[a]	Population	Aggregate Personal Income
$2,000 and over	764,000	$1,630,923,000
$1,800 to $2,000	728,700	1,431,080,000
$1,600 to $1,800	1,149,000	1,957,245,000
$1,400 to $1,600	563,300	872,936,000
$1,200 to $1,400	395,200	495,262,000
$1,000 to $1,200	132,500	139,506,000
$ 800 to $1,000	97,800	85,344,000
$ 600 to $ 800	43,300	28,704,000
Total	3,874,200	6,641,000,000

Source: Wylie Kilpatrick, "Personal Income Received in Florida
Counties: 1956," *Economic Leaflets*, XXV, No. 4 (May, 1958), p. 2.

[a]For grouping of counties see Table 15.

TABLE 23

AGGREGATE PERSONAL INCOME AND POPULATION AS A PER CENT OF THE STATE
TOTALS AMONG THE EIGHT CATEGORIES OF PERSONAL INCOME PER CAPITA
WHEN THE FLORIDA COUNTIES ARE GROUPED ACCORDING TO
PERSONAL INCOME PER CAPITA

Personal Income Per Capita[a]	Population	Aggregate Personal Income
$2,000 and over	19.73%	24.56%
$1,800 to $2,000	18.81	21.55
$1,600 to $1,800	29.66	29.47
$1,400 to $1,600	14.54	13.14
$1,200 to $1,400	10.20	7.46
$1,000 to $1,200	3.42	2.10
$ 800 to $1,000	2.52	1.29
$ 600 to $ 800	1.12	.43
Total	100.00	100.00

Derived from data presented in Table 22.

[a]For grouping of counties see Table 15.

exceptions can be found in Hendry County which ranks first in personal income per capita and 55 in population, and Collier County which ranks eight in personal income per capita and 39 in population.

Relating Assessed Valuation of Non-Exempt Property and Aggregate Personal Income to Personal Income Per Capita

Table 24 shows the assessed valuation of non-exempt property and aggregate personal income as a per cent of the aggregates among the eight groups of counties classified according to personal income per capita. Table 24 shows a third measure, the number of dollars in assessed valuation of non-exempt property per dollar of aggregate personal income in each of the eight groups of counties classified according to personal income per capita. These data indicate higher assessed valuation in relation to personal income at the upper and lower limits of the eight categories of personal income per capita.

Table 25 shows dollars in assessing valuation of non-exempt property per dollar of personal income for each of the counties in Florida. These data show a variation from $ .11 to $1.99 or a range of $1.88. Johns makes the following observation:

> . . . a number of studies on economic indices . . . report a fairly high relationship between income and the true value of property even in political units the size of counties.[12]

Personal income and assessed valuation of non-exempt property show a fairly constant ratio when the counties are classified according to

---

[12]National Conference of Professors of Educational Administration, Problems and Issues in Public School Finance (New York: Bureau of Publications, Teachers College, Columbia University, 1952), p. 227.

TABLE 24

ASSESSED VALUATION OF NON-EXEMPT PROPERTY AND AGGREGATE PERSONAL INCOME
AS A PER CENT OF THE STATE TOTALS AMONG THE EIGHT CATEGORIES OF
PERSONAL INCOME PER CAPITA; AND DOLLARS IN ASSESSED
VALUATION PER DOLLAR PERSONAL INCOME IN EACH
OF THE EIGHT GROUPS OF COUNTIES CLASSIFIED
ACCORDING TO PERSONAL INCOME PER CAPITA

Personal Income Per Capita[a]	Assessed Valuation of Non-Exempt Property[b]	Aggregate Personal Income[c]	Dollars in Assessed Valuation Per Dollar Personal Income
$2,000 and over	30.49%	24.56%	$ .76
$1,800 to $2,000	14.56	21.55	.41
$1,600 to $1,800	31.57	29.47	.65
$1,400 to $1,600	12.89	13.14	.51
$1,200 to $1,400	6.82	7.45	.56
$1,000 to $1,200	1.70	2.10	.49
$ 800 to $1,000	1.47	1.29	.69
$ 600 to $ 800	.50	.43	.72
Total	100.00	100.00	.61

[a]For grouping of counties see Table 15.

[b]Derived from data presented in Table 17.

[c]Derived from data presented in Table 32.

TABLE 25

DOLLARS IN ASSESSED VALUATION OF NON-EXEMPT PROPERTY[a] PER
DOLLAR OF PERSONAL INCOME[b] IN THE FLORIDA COUNTIES

County	Dollars in Assessed Valuation per Dollar Personal Income	County	Dollars in Assessed Valuation per Dollar Personal Income
Alachua	$ .590	Hendry	$ .496
Baker	.621	Hernando	.840
Bay	.434	Highlands	.755
Bradford	.589	Hillsborough	.604
Brevard	.427	Holmes	.593
Broward	1.021	Indian River	.755
Calhoun	.418	Jackson	.322
Charlotte	1.039	Jefferson	.799
Citrus	1.633	Lafayette	.764
Clay	.465	Lake	.636
Collier	.842	Lee	1.510
Columbia	.517	Leon	.545
Dade	.812	Levy	.923
DeSoto	.406	Liberty	.625
Dixie	1.991	Madison	.532
Duval	.414	Manatee	.732
Escambia	.298	Marion	.652
Flagler	.980	Martin	1.103
Franklin	1.545	Monroe	.621
Gadsden	.261	Nassau	.818
Gilchrist	.829	Okaloosa	.107
Glades	.774	Okeechobee	.928
Gulf	.580	Orange	.506
Hamilton	.451	Osceola	.912
Hardee	.434	Palm Beach	.684

TABLE-25--Continued

County	Dollars in Assessed Valuation per Dollar Personal Income	County	Dollars in Assessed Valuation per Dollar Personal Income
Pasco	$ .547	Suwanne	$ .682
Pinellas	1.039	Taylor	.669
Polk	.639	Union	.372
Putnam	.863	Volusia	.925
St. Johns	.466	Wakulla	.824
St. Lucie	.534	Walton	.492
Santa Roas	.309	Washington	.370
Sarasota	.505		
Seminole	.647		
Sumter	.510		

[a]Source: Report of the Comptroller of the State of Florida (Tallahassee: Office of Comptroller, 1955), pp. 66-67.

[b]Source: Wylie Kilpatrick, "Personal Income Received in Florida Counties: 1956," Economic Leaflets, XXV, No. 4 (May, 1958), p. 2.

personal income per capita. The ratios for the individual counties
show wide variations.

Calculating Equalized Assessed Valuations of Non-Exempt Property Using the Index of Taxpaying Ability

The index of taxpaying ability[13] as prescribed in the _Florida_
Statutes is a scale for approximating the distribution of economic
potential among the several counties in Florida. Equalized assessed
valuation of non-exempt property for this study was obtained as a
product of the index of taxpaying ability for the individual county
times the total assessed valuation of non-exempt property in the
state, excluding the assessed valuation of intangible property.
Equalized assessed valuation as derived from the indices of taxpaying
ability applied to aggregate assessed valuation of non-exempt property
in the state represents an equalization based upon average assessment
practice. Equalization is based upon average assessment practice and
not upon any given ratio to true value of property. Table 26 shows
an equalized assessed valuation of non-exempt property in the several
Florida counties.

Table 27 shows the assessed valuation of non-exempt property,
equalized assessed valuation of non-exempt property, and aggregate
personal income as a per cent of the aggregates among the eight groups
of counties classified according to personal income per capita. When
the three measures are examined there appears to be greater similarity
in the distribution of equalized assessed valuation of non-exempt

---

[13]Florida, _Revised Statutes_ (1957), sec. 236.071.

TABLE 26

EQUALIZED ASSESSED VALUATION OF NON-EXEMPT PROPERTY AS DERIVED FROM
ASSESSED VALUATION OF NON-EXEMPT PROPERTY BY MEANS OF
THE INDEX OF TAXPAYING ABILITY

County	Non-Exempt Assessed Valuation[a]	Index of Taxpaying Ability[b]	Equalized Assessed Valuation[c]
Alachua	$ 46,580,344	1.3830	$ 55,679,876
Baker	3,286,395	.1549	6,236,300
Bay	36,222,491	1.1221	45,175,937
Bradford	5,463,638	.2572	10,350,890
Brevard	26,777,748	.9884	35,767,135
Broward	306,015,597	5.1028	205,439,595
Calhoun	2,175,458	.1110	4,468,879
Charlotte	7,609,094	.1699	6,840,203
Citrus	9,156,809	.2172	8,744,509
Clay	10,260,139	.2883	11,607,007
Collier	16,354,639	.3217	12,951,697
Columbia	10,951,201	.4280	17,231,353
Dade	1,223,162,067	23.0665	928,661,211
DeSoto	5,042,908	.2477	9,972,444
Dixie	6,340,171	.0866	3,486,531
Duval	311,401,126	10.0738	405,572,901
Escambia	71,495,318	3.0813	124,053,662
Flagler	5,657,220	.1921	7,733,979
Franklin	5,700,679	.1099	4,424,593
Gadsden	12,209,512	.6555	26,390,541
Gilchrist	2,314,820	.0855	3,442,245
Glades	3,469,626	.1019	4,102,511
Gulf	8,675,378	.2283	9,191,397
Hamilton	3,297,556	.1628	6,554,356
Hardee	6,125,077	.2991	12,041,817
Hendry	9,734,432	.3013	12,130,389
Hernando	7,396,747	.2230	8,978,018
Highlands	19,305,767	.4839	19,481,896
Hillsborough	292,308,555	8.2623	332,641,603
Holmes	4,553,086	.1977	7,959,436

TABLE 26—Continued

County	Non-Exempt Assessed Valuation[a]	Index of Taxpaying Ability[b]	Equalized Assessed Valuation[c]
Indian River	$ 18,123,118	.4868	$ 19,598,651
Jackson	11,595,641	.6479	26,084,564
Jefferson	6,513,570	.2173	8,748,535
Lafayette	2,334,424	.0645	2,596,781
Lake	49,563,255	1.3764	55,414,098
Lee	27,938,501	.9806	39,479,123
Leon	49,905,538	1.3124	52,837,447
Levy	8,648,303	.2534	10,201,927
Liberty	1,538,331	.0538	2,165,997
Madison	6,761,803	.2824	11,369,472
Manatee	34,663,290	1.1747	47,293,622
Marion	38,455,721	1.2064	48,569,869
Martin	16,984,570	.3239	13,040,269
Monroe	43,355,084	.7034	28,355,238
Nassau	15,610,696	.4256	17,134,728
Okaloosa	7,848,040	.5313	21,390,228
Okeechobee	4,034,353	.1162	4,678,232
Orange	142,970,775	4.9014	197,331,197
Osceola	11,491,285	.3231	13,008,061
Palm Beach	187,170,432	4.9071	197,560,680
Pasco	17,502,464	.7356	29,615,381
Pinellas	368,147,940	6.5901	265,318,546
Polk	174,550,223	4.5901	188,357,205
Putnam	31,707,624	.6536	26,314,047
St. Johns	19,718,628	.8745	35,207,519
St. Lucie	21,335,835	.7357	29,619,407
Santa Rosa	5,053,931	.2767	11,139,989
Sarasota	39,476,070	1.4634	58,916,733
Seminole	27,421,678	.8249	33,210,614
Sumter	5,709,653	.3140	12,641,693

TABLE 26—Continued

County	Non-Exempt Assessed Valuation[a]	Index of Taxpaying Ability[b]	Equalized Assessed Valuation[c]
Suwannee	$ 11,280,386	.3720	$ 14,976,783
Taylor	10,493,509	.3564	14,348,725
Union	1,418,856	.0856	3,446,271
Volusia	116,293,257	2.8362	114,185,894
Wakulla	2,584,202	.0754	3,035,617
Walton	5,770,736	.2693	10,842,064
Washington	3,001,764	.1638	6,594,616
State	4,026,017,174	100.0000	4,026,017,174

[a]Source: Report of the Comptroller of the State of Florida (Tallahassee: Office of Comptroller, 1955), pp. 66-67.

[b]Source: "The Revised Index of Taxpaying Ability for the Year 1955-56" (Tallahassee: State Department of Education, 1955), p. 1.

[c]Equalized assessed valuation of non-exempt property calculated as follows:

county index of taxpaying ability x $4,026,017,174 = equalized assessed valuation of non-exempt property.

TABLE 27

ASSESSED VALUATION OF NON-EXEMPT PROPERTY, EQUALIZED ASSESSED VALUATION
OF NON-EXEMPT PROPERTY, AND AGGREGATE PERSONAL INCOME AS A PER CENT
OF THE AGGREGATES AMONG THE EIGHT GROUPS OF COUNTIES CLASSIFIED
ACCORDING TO PERSONAL INCOME PER CAPITA

Personal Income Per Capita[a]	Assessed Valuation of Non-Exempt Property[b]	Equalized Assessed Valuation of Non-Exempt Property[c]	Aggregate Personal Income[d]
$2,000 and over	30.49%	24.65%	24.56%
$1,800 to $2,000	14.56	19.20	21.55
$1,600 to $1,800	31.57	26.59	29.47
$1,400 to $1,600	12.89	15.30	13.14
$1,200 to $1,400	6.82	8.39	7.45
$1,000 to $1,200	1.70	2.90	2.10
$ 800 to $1,000	1.47	2.20	1.20
$ 600 to $ 800	.50	.75	.43
Total	100.00	100.00	100.00

[a]For grouping of counties see Table 15.

[b]Derived from data presented in Table 17.

[c]Derived from data presented in Table 26.

[d]Derived from data presented in Table 22.

property and aggregate personal income than between assessed valuation of non-exempt property and aggregate personal income. The similarity between the distribution of equalized assessed valuation of non-exempt property and aggregate personal income should exist because the equalization is the result of the application of the index of taxpaying ability.

Measurement of Educational Load

Local ability to support education is directly related to the incidence of pupil population upon the school district. Simple counting of pupils such as pupil census does not relate pupil load to several variables in the cost of operating schools. Averages such as average daily attendance or average daily membership do not account for several variables in the cost of operating schools. The instructional unit[14] as defined by the Florida Statutes includes a weighting to help account for isolation, special programs, and other variables in the cost of instruction. Transportation is also an important factor in the cost of operating schools. Increased consolidation of school centers and the geographical spread of the population has made transportation an important factor in the cost of education. The Florida foundation program calculates transportation costs in terms of the transportation unit.[15] The transportation unit includes a measure involving the number of pupils transported and the distance the pupils are transported. The combination of the instruction unit

---

[14]Florida, Revised Statutes (1957), sec. 236.04.

[15]Ibid., sec. 236.05.

and the transportation unit produces a weighted measure of the
incidence of pupil population which compensates for several variables
in the cost of operating schools.

The relative cost of a transportation unit is about one-third
the cost of an instruction unit in the state foundation program. To
relate the two units in terms of cost the logical combination would
be the sum of instruction units and one-third the number of transpor-
tation units. The combination of transportation units and instruction
units on an equivalent cost basis approximates, within the level of
the state foundation program, a measure of educational load. For this
study the combination of instruction units and one-third of the
transportation units was called the educational load unit. The
measure of educational load is a weighted measure in terms of in-
structional costs, sparcity, and transportation costs. Table 28 shows
the educational load units for each of the Florida counties.

Table 29 shows the educational load units in each of the eight
groups of counties classified according to personal income per capita.
Table 30 shows equalized assessed valuation of non-exempt property and
educational load units as a per cent of the aggregates among the groups
of counties classified according to personal income per capita. These
data reveal considerable variation in the distribution of taxpaying
ability and the distribution of educational load. The more accurate
measure of local financial ability would appear to be in some relation-
ship of equalized assessed valuation of non-exempt property and educa-
tion load.

TABLE 28

EDUCATIONAL LOAD UNITS AS DERIVED FROM INSTRUCTION UNITS AND
TRANSPORTATION UNITS

County	Instruction Units[a]	Transportation Units[b]	Educational Load Units[c]
Alachua	555.06	84.90	583.36
Baker	73.40	18.27	79.18
Bay	511.48	48.87	527.77
Bradford	140.00	29.69	149.90
Brevard	357.14	70.74	380.72
Broward	1,105.59	125.79	1,147.52
Calhoun	110.68	25.37	119.14
Charlotte	31.20	11.70	35.10
Citrus	70.84	20.81	77.78
Clay	124.86	32.26	135.61
Collier	91.06	18.15	97.12
Columbia	212.59	50.05	229.27
Dade	4,308.87	212.17	4,379.59
DeSoto	77.22	13.28	81.65
Dixie	46.28	16.44	51.76
Duval	2,760.10	220.98	2,833.76
Escambia	1,256.87	155.70	1,308.77
Flagler	41.51	13.28	45.94
Franklin	60.30	10.15	63.68
Gadsden	323.86	69.91	347.16
Gilchrist	46.60	15.06	51.62
Glades	25.76	9.35	28.88
Gulf	103.97	15.46	109.12
Hamilton	114.88	32.26	125.63
Hardee	105.50	28.56	115.02
Hendry	64.68	8.88	67.62
Hernando	72.55	20.82	79.49
Highlands	162.44	31.22	172.84
Hillsborough	2,278.04	194.13	2,342.75
Holmes	149.31	41.80	163.24

TABLE 28—Continued

County	Instruction Units[a]	Transportation Units[b]	Educational Load Units[c]
Indian River	131.49	21.77	138.75
Jackson	436.88	96.00	468.88
Jefferson	117.65	38.71	130.55
Lafayette	36.75	17.10	42.45
Lake	390.10	67.87	412.72
Lee	255.80	47.58	271.66
Leon	543.35	81.23	571.43
Levy	122.47	43.18	136.86
Liberty	44.19	15.76	49.44
Madison	166.59[d]	49.78[d]	176.52
Manatee	370.11	59.29	389.87
Marion	439.78	88.73	469.36
Martin	84.33	19.18	90.72
Monroe	219.72	11.79	223.65
Nassau	167.61	39.58	180.80
Okaloosa	331.25	70.87	354.87
Okeechobee	42.97	13.05	47.32
Orange	1,269.54	138.15	1,315.59
Osceola	98.13	20.83	105.07
Palm Beach	1,074.56	97.16	1,106.95
Pasco	217.67	46.19	233.03
Pinellas	1,343.68	128.72	1,386.59
Polk	1,374.78	194.01	1,439.45
Putnam	258.05	43.73	272.63
St. Johns	191.59	34.86	203.21
St. Lucie	213.69	28.03	223.03
Santa Rosa	218.93	56.81	237.86
Sarasota	321.94	46.99	337.60
Seminole	260.46	40.53	273.97
Sumter	129.30	28.40	138.77

[d]Ten instruction units earned in ADA transferred to transportation units, /236.05 (1), Florida Statutes/.

TABLE 28--Continued

County	Instruction Units[a]	Transportation Units[b]	Educational Load Units[c]
Suwannee	182.44	48.13	198.48
Taylor	120.60	32.43	131.41
Union	43.63	14.99	48.63
Volusia	712.71	81.05	739.73
Wakulla	63.68	23.56	71.53
Walton	168.74	51.22	185.81
Washington	138.91	39.64	152.12
Total	27,686.91	3,622.96	28,894.56

[a]Source: Florida, Department of Education, obtained by written request.

[b]Source: Ibid.

[c]Educational load units calculated as follows:

$$\text{instruction units} + \frac{\text{transportation units}}{3} = \text{educational load unit}$$

TABLE 29

EDUCATIONAL LOAD UNITS IN EACH OF THE EIGHT CATEGORIES OF PERSONAL
INCOME PER CAPITA WHEN THE FLORIDA COUNTIES ARE CLASSIFIED
ACCORDING TO PERSONAL INCOME PER CAPITA

Personal Income Per Capita[a]	Educational Load Units[b]
$2,000 and over	4,447.21
$1,800 to $2,000	5,111.02
$1,600 to $1,800	8,308.63
$1,400 to $1,600	4,229.64
$1,200 to $1,400	3,417.08
$1,000 to $1,200	1,628.82
$ 800 to $1,000	1,218.68
$ 600 to $ 800	633.48
Total	28,994.56

[a]For grouping of counties see Table 15.

[b]Derived from data presented in Table 28.

TABLE 30

EQUALIZED ASSESSED VALUATION OF NON-EXEMPT PROPERTY AND EDUCATIONAL LOAD
UNITS AS A PER CENT OF THE AGGREGATES AMONG THE EIGHT CATEGORIES OF
PERSONAL INCOME PER CAPITA WHEN THE FLORIDA COUNTIES ARE GROUPED
ACCORDING TO PERSONAL INCOME PER CAPITA

Personal Income Per Capita[a]	Equalized Assessed Valuation of Non-Exempt Property[b]	Educational Load Units[c]
$2,000 and over	24.67%	15.70%
$1,800 to $2,000	19.20	17.69
$1,600 to $1,800	26.59	27.68
$1,400 to $1,600	15.30	14.93
$1,200 to $1,400	8.39	12.06
$1,000 to $1,200	2.90	5.75
$ 800 to $1,000	2.20	4.30
$ 600 to $ 800	.75	1.89
Total	100.00	100.00

[a]For grouping of counties see Table 15.

[b]Data from Table 27.

[c]Data from Table 29.

Measuring Local Ability in Relation to
Educational Load

Data presented in Table 27 compared the distribution of
assessed valuation of non-exempt property, equalized assessed valua-
tion of non-exempt property, and aggregate personal income. Assessed
valuation of non-exempt property shows a similar pattern of distribu-
tion to aggregate personal income when the Florida counties are
grouped according to personal income per capita. The pattern of
similarity can be further demonstrated by examination of trends over
a period of years. Table 31 shows a trend analysis of assessed valua-
tion of non-exempt property and aggregate personal income for a six-
year period. These data indicate the per cent increase in assessed
valuation of non-exempt property and the per cent increase in aggregate
personal income are similar.

TABLE 31

PER CENT CHANGE IN ASSESSED VALUATION OF
NON-EXEMPT PROPERTY AND PERSONAL INCOME

Economic Factor	Per Cent Increase for Six Years	Per Cent Increase Yearly
Assessed valuation of non-exempt property, 1951-57[a]	81.11	13.52
Aggregate personal income, 1950-56[b]	82.40	13.73

[a]Data taken from Table 8.

[b]Wylie Kilpatrick, "Personal Income Received in Florida
Counties: 1956," Economic Leaflets, XXV, No. 4 (May, 1958), p. 2.

Data presented in Table 27 indicate equalized assessed valuation of non-exempt property shows a more similar pattern of distribution to aggregate personal income than does assessed valuation of non-exempt property. The index of taxpaying ability help to relate equalized assessed valuation to personal income.

Two measures of local ability to finance education emerge in the form of equalized assessed valuation of non-exempt property and aggregate personal income. The two measures can be further refined by relating them to educational load. Table 32 shows the two measures of ability for the several counties in Florida. The two measures of ability are expressed as follows: (1) equalized assessed valuation of non-exempt property per unit of educational load, and (2) aggregate personal income per unit of educational load.

Local support of education in Florida under existing conditions is almost wholly dependent upon the property tax. The measure of local ability should also be related to the property tax. Therefore, equalized assessed valuation of non-exempt property per unit of educational load appears to be a suitable measure of local ability.

Aggregate personal income per unit of educational load does measure a dimension of local ability. Aggregate personal income and equalized assessed valuation of non-exempt property have demonstrated a close similarity but the two measures have individual characteristics. Aggregate personal income per unit of educational load appears to measure another dimension of local ability, namely, the ability for paying other types of taxes.

TABLE 32

TWO MEASURES OF LOCAL ABILITY IN THE FLORIDA COUNTIES

County	Equalized Assessed Valuation[a] Per Unit of Educational Load[b]	Aggregate Personal Income[c] Per Unit of Educational Load[b]
Alachua	$ 95,447	$140,507
Baker	78,761	70,434
Bay	85,598	161,015
Bradford	69,052	64,483
Brevard	93,946	269,056
Broward	179,029	290,786
Calhoun	37,509	43,890
Charlotte	194,878	213,219
Citrus	112,426	79,391
Clay	85,591	168,645
Collier	133,358	241,928
Columbia	75,157	94,304
Dade	212,043	367,647
DeSoto	122,136	154,832
Dixie	67,360	60,201
Duval	143,122	281,871
Escambia	94,864	262,092
Flagler	168,350	150,849
Franklin	69,482	68,247
Gadsden	76,018	134,952
Gilchrist	66,684	55,463
Glades	142,054	156,544
Gulf	84,232	141,413
Hamilton	52,172	59,428
Hardee	104,693	132,942
Hendry	179,391	307,320
Hernando	112,945	124,305
Highlands	112,716	157,678
Hillsborough	141,988	225,958
Holmes	48,759	197,261

TABLE 32--Continued

County	Equalized Assessed Valuation[a] Per Unit of Educational Load	Aggregate Personal Income[c] Per Unit of Educational Load[b]
Indian River	$141,252	$197,261
Jackson	55,632	78,722
Jefferson	67,013	67,292
Lafayette	61,172	71,802
Lake	134,266	196,399
Lee	145,325	199,834
Leon	92,465	166,047
Levy	74,543	71,102
Liberty	43,811	49,960
Madison	64,409	73,056
Manatee	121,306	151,466
Marion	103,481	127,359
Martin	143,742	193,585
Monroe	124,012	335,994
Nassau	94,772	109,165
Okaloosa	60,276	246,778
Okeechobee	98,864	95,647
Orange	149,994	264,823
Osceola	123,804	124,041
Palm Beach	178,473	302,234
Pasco	127,088	142,115
Pinellas	191,346	274,426
Polk	130,854	201,093
Putnam	96,519	143,124
St. Johns	173,257	221,431
St. Lucie	132,805	191,468
Santa Rosa	46,834	97,797
Sarasota	174,516	249,591
Seminole	121,220	159,981
Sumter	91,098	79,801

TABLE 32—Continued

County	Equalized Assessed Valuation[a] Per Unit of Educational Load[b]	Aggregate Personal Income[c] Per Unit of Educational Load[b]
Suwannee	$ 75,457	$ 85,056
Taylor	109,191	122,358
Union	70,867	79,848
Volusia	154,362	185,588
Wakulla	42,498	44,177
Walton	48,350	62,467
Washington	43,351	56,054
State	139,335	229,836

[a]Data from Table 26.

[b]Data from Table 28.

[c]Source: Wylie Kilpatrick, "Personal Income Received in Florida Counties: 1956," _Economic Leaflets_, XXV, No. 4 (May, 1958), p. 2.

Conclusions

      Ability to support education involves measures of several
dimensions. The following basic data were examined:

1. Personal income
2. Assessed valuation of non-exempt property
3. Instructional units
4. Transportation units
5. Index of taxpaying ability

These data indicate characteristics of the tri-dimensional nature of
local ability: (1) valuation of property, the main source of local
support; (2) measure of personal income, the potential for local
support money; and (3) pupil distribution, the educational load carried
by the local school district.

      The basic data were combined to produce more precise measures
of the tri-dimensional characteristics of local ability. The follow-
ing measures were derived:

1. Units of educational load
2. Equalized assessed valuation of non-exempt property
3. Ratio of personal income to assessed valuation of
   non-exempt property

The combination of instructional units and transportation units pro-
duced a weighted measure of educational load in terms of cost. The
ratio of aggregate personal income to assessed valuation of non-exempt
property provided a test of existing assessment practice in terms of
ability. Equalized assessed valuation of non-exempt property dis-
tributed average assessment of non-exempt property according to an
independent scale for measuring taxpaying ability.

      The measure of educational load was applied to aggregate

personal income and equalized assessed valuation of non-exempt property to produce the following measures:

1. Aggregate personal income per unit of educational load
2. Equalized assessed valuation of non-exempt property per unit of educational load

The accepted measure of local ability for this study was equalized assessed valuation of non-exempt property per unit of educational load. Aggregate personal income per unit of educational load will be used in another section of this study as a measure of ability other than taxpaying ability for the support of schools.

CHAPTER IV

LOCAL FINANCIAL EFFORT IN THE
SUPPORT OF EDUCATION

The level at which the educational needs of a community are
met is limited by the extent of local financial resources. In some
communities economic resources are so limited that despite considera-
ble effort the level of support is inadequate. The foundation
program jointly financed from state and local funds is one method
for guaranteeing an acceptable minimum educational program. The
enrichment of educational opportunity beyond the acceptable minimum
of a foundation program is to a considerable extent the result of
local financial effort. It is the purpose in this chapter to measure
the financial effort exerted by the several counties in Florida.

School Revenue in Florida

Revenue for the support of schools in Florida is derived
from three levels of government—Federal, state, and local. Varia-
tions in the method of revenue distribution[1] affect the amount of
revenue made available to the individual school systems. Table 33
shows the amount of school funds for the support of education by
source for each of the eight groups of Florida counties classified

---

[1]Some of the bases for fund distribution are: (1) objective
need, (2) flat grants, (3) matching funds, (4) population, (5) special
grants, (6) grants in lieu of taxes, and (7) grants-in-aid.

TABLE 33

FUNDS FOR THE SUPPORT OF EDUCATION WHEN THE FLORIDA COUNTIES ARE DISTRIBUTED INTO EIGHT CATEGORIES ACCORDING TO PERSONAL INCOME PER CAPITA

Personal Income Per Capita[a]	Federal Funds[b]	State Funds[c]	Racing Comm. Funds[d],[e]	Local Funds[f]	All Funds
$2,000 and over	$ 236,894	$ 4,101,969	$ 186,500	$25,056,218	$ 39,581,581
$1,800 to $2,000	2,360,370	18,148,863	285,640	11,959,050	32,753,923
$1,600 to $1,800	2,373,855	30,796,117	734,683	23,311,828	57,216,513
$1,400 to $1,600	543,017	4,285,364	649,150	9,774,158	25,251,589
$1,200 to $1,400	646,582	11,808,747	797,283	5,999,297	19,851,909
$1,000 to $1,200	426,383	6,199,111	808,850	4,363,259	9,107,616
$ 800 to $1,000	265,474	4,430,656	736,377	900,930	9,613,437
$ 600 to $ 800	130,295	1,973,894	509,025	323,520	2,936,734
Total	6,982,900	102,044,724	4,717,508	78,868,270	192,613,402

Source: Biennial Report Superintendent of Public Instruction, 1954-56 (Tallahassee: State Department of Education, 1957), pp. 184-191, 196-199.

[a]For grouping of counties see Table 15.

[b]Federal funds are distributed for special purposes, i.e., vocational funds, national forest funds, school lunch funds, veterans' education funds, payment in lieu of taxes, federal impact funds, etc.

[c]State funds are distributed in the following manner: (1) state foundation program funds—instruction, transportation, current operation, and capital outlay; (2) special funds—textbooks, state forest funds, interest on investments, and driver education.

[d]Racing Commission funds for schools are apportioned by agreement between the local board of

106

TABLE 33—Continued

county commissioners and the local board of public instruction.

^{e}This column not included in the "all funds" column.

^{f}All counties use local funds to fulfill the local required contribution for participation in the state foundation program. Local funds in excess of the contribution to the state foundation program are used for enrichment of the local educational program.

according to personal income per capita. Table 34 shows the per cent of aggregate funds from each source in each of the eight groups of counties classified according to personal income per capita. These data indicate Federal funds represent a small proportion of total school revenue in each of the eight categories. Federal funds show a variation in the eight categories from .60 per cent to 7.21 per cent or a range of 6.61 per cent. The average for the state was 3.63 per cent. State funds show an inverse relationship to personal income per capita when the Florida counties are grouped according to personal income per capita. The inverse relationship between state funds and income per capita results from the method for distributing most of the state funds for school support. Counties with low ability receive a higher proportion of the total cost of the foundation program from the state. Racing Commission funds show an inverse relationship to personal income per capita when the Florida counties are distributed according to personal income per capita. Racing Commission funds are a flat grant to county government. The use of the Racing Commission fund is determined as follows: (1) action of the county commissioners, or (2) the Legislature by special local act having local application. Racing Commission funds are state collected taxes which are distributed to the counties and are in essence state funds. When state funds are combined with Racing Commission funds the aggregate still shows an inverse relationship to personal income per capita. Local funds show a direct

TABLE 34

FUNDS FOR THE SUPPORT OF EDUCATION AS A PER CENT OF THE AGGREGATE FOR
EACH OF THE EIGHT CATEGORIES WHEN THE FLORIDA COUNTIES ARE
DISTRIBUTED ACCORDING TO PERSONAL INCOME PER CAPITA

Personal Income Per Capita[a]	Federal Funds	State Funds	Racing Comm. Funds	State and Racing Comm. Funds[b]	Local Funds	All Funds
$2,000 and over	.60%	35.63%	.47%	36.10%	63.30%	100.00%
$1,800 to $2,000	7.21	55.41	.87	56.28	36.51	100.00
$1,600 to $1,800	4.25	53.73	1.35	55.08	40.67	100.00
$1,400 to $1,600	2.15	56.57	2.57	59.14	38.71	100.00
$1,200 to $1,400	3.36	61.34	4.14	65.48	31.16	100.00
$1,000 to $1,200	4.68	71.36	8.99	80.35	14.97	100.00
$ 800 to $1,000	4.14	69.08	11.48	80.56	15.30	100.00
$ 600 to $ 800	4.44	67.21	17.34	84.55	11.01	100.00
State	3.63	52.99	2.43	55.42	40.95	100.00

Derived from data presented in Table 33.

[a]For grouping of counties see Table 15.

[b]This column is not included in the "all funds" column.

relationship to income per capita when the Florida counties are
grouped according to personal income per capita. Local funds in-
crease as the level of income per capita increases. The following
factors account for part of the relationship: (1) greater local
contribution is required for participation in the state foundation
program as local ability increases, and (2) more local effort to
go beyond the acceptable minimum of the foundation program in the
higher levels of ability.

Table 35 shows funds for the support of education as a per
cent of the aggregates when the Florida counties are distributed
according to personal income per capita. Federal funds do not
show a consistent relationship to personal income per capita.
The pattern of distribution indicates Federal funds are distributed
for special programs and not in relation to local ability. State
funds show an inverse relationship to personal income per capita,
a fact which was borne out in Table 34. Racing Commission funds
indicate a higher proportion as a part of the support structure for
counties in the lower categories of personal income per capita.
Racing Commission funds are not distributed in relation to local
ability but the counties with smaller educational load tend to rely
on Racing Commission funds for a larger portion of the school budget.
Local funds show a direct relationship with personal income per
capita, a fact which was borne out in Table 34.

Table 36 shows funds for the support of education per unit
of educational load when the Florida counties are distributed according

TABLE 35

FUNDS FOR THE SUPPORT OF EDUCATION AS PER CENT OF THE AGGREGATES WHEN
THE FLORIDA COUNTIES ARE DISTRIBUTED ACCORDING TO
PERSONAL INCOME PER CAPITA

Personal Income Per Capita[a]	Federal Funds	State Funds	Racing Comm. Funds	Local Funds	All Funds
$2,000 and over	3.39%	13.82%	3.95%	31.77%	20.55%
$1,800 to $2,000	33.80	17.79	6.05	15.16	17.01
$1,600 to $1,800	34.00	30.18	15.57	29.56	29.76
$1,400 to $1,600	7.78	13.99	13.76	12.39	13.11
$1,200 to $1,400	9.26	11.57	16.90	7.61	10.03
$1,000 to $1,200	6.11	6.37	17.36	1.73	4.73
$ 800 to $1,000	3.80	4.34	15.61	1.24	3.33
$ 600 to $ 800	1.86	1.94	10.80	.54	1.48
Total	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00

Derived from data presented in Table 33.

[a]For grouping of counties see Table 15.

TABLE 36

FUNDS FOR THE SUPPORT OF EDUCATION PER MEASURE OF EDUCATIONAL LOAD
WHEN THE FLORIDA COUNTIES ARE DISTRIBUTED INTO EIGHT CATEGORIES
ACCORDING TO PERSONAL INCOME PER CAPITA

Personal Income Per Capita[a]	Federal Funds	State Funds	Racing Commission Funds	State and Racing Commission Funds	Local Funds	All Funds
$2,000 and over	$ 53	$3171	$ 43	$3214	$5634	$8901
$1,800 to $2,000	462	3551	56	3563	2340	6409
$1,600 to $1,800	286	3706	88	3794	2806	6886
$1,400 to $1,600	128	3377	153	3530	2311	5969
$1,200 to $1,400	189	3456	233	3689	1756	5634
$1,000 to $1,200	262	3989	503	4492	837	5591
$ 800 to $1,000	218	3635	604	4239	805	5262
$ 600 to $ 800	244	3703	954	4657	607	5508
State	243	3531	163	3694	2729	6666

Derived from data presented in Table 28 and Table 33.

[a]For grouping of counties see Table 15.

to personal income per capita. Federal funds per unit of educational load among the groups of counties classified according to personal income per capita show a variation from $53 to $462 or a range of $409. The average for the state was $243 per unit of educational load. State funds per unit of educational load among the groups of counties classified according to personal income per capita show a variation from $3,171 to $3,989 or a range of $818. The average for the state was $3,531 per unit of educational load. Local funds per unit of educational load among the groups of counties classified according to personal income per capita show a variation from $607 to $5,634 or a range of $5,027. The average for the state was $2,729 per unit of educational load. Racing Commission funds per unit of educational load among the groups of counties classified according to personal income per capita show a variation from $43 to $965 or a range of $911. The average for the state was $163 per unit of educational load. The aggregate of all funds for the support of education per unit of educational load among the counties when grouped according to personal income per capita show a variation from $5,252 to $8,901 or a range of $3,639. The average for the state was $6,666 per unit of educational load. One characteristic of aggregate funds per unit of educational load among the counties when distributed according to personal income per capita reveals higher expenditures at the higher levels of personal income per capita with a leveling effect among the remaining levels of personal income per capita. Data presented in Table 36 indicate

the support structure for education in Florida is producing a similar rate of expenditure per unit of educational load among a majority of the counties when the counties are grouped according to personal income per capita. The limited number of counties distributed in the higher categories of personal income per capita tend to have higher expenditures per unit of educational load.

The over-all effect of the Florida support program for education can be expressed in terms of gross expenditure per unit of educational load. In this study the gross expenditure per unit of educational load was called gross level of financial support. Table 37 shows the gross level of financial support for the several counties in Florida. Gross level of financial support varies from $4,768 to $9,206 or a range of $4,438. The average for the state was $6,666 per unit of educational load. Gross level of financial support combines the characteristics of equalization in state-local support within the state foundation program, local financial initiative by the several counties, and special financial supplements from miscellaneous sources.

The effect of local support of education in Florida can be expressed in terms of the gross local expenditure per unit of educational load. In this study the gross local expenditure per unit of educational load was called gross local level of financial support. Table 37 shows the gross local level of financial support for the several counties in Florida. Gross local level of support varies from $558 to $5,706 or a range of $5,148. The average for

TABLE 37

TWO MEASURES OF FINANCIAL SUPPORT OF EDUCATION IN THE FLORIDA COUNTIES

County	Gross Local Level of Financial Support[a]	Gross Level of Financial Support[b]
Alachua	$2,106	$6,751
Baker	1,859	5,891
Bay	1,443	5,396
Bradford	1,060	4,943
Brevard	2,066	7,530
Broward	4,400	8,044
Calhoun	980	4,919
Charlotte	4,875	8,240
Citrus	2,344	6,001
Clay	1,863	6,293
Collier	3,436	7,136
Columbia	1,313	5,054
Dade	5,706	8,928
DeSoto	1,996	5,521
Dixie	3,039	7,004
Duval	2,282	5,910
Escambia	1,417	6,396
Flagler	1,762	5,842
Franklin	2,352	6,126
Gadsden	1,101	4,768
Gilchrist	2,471	6,358
Glades	3,696	6,991
Gulf	2,237	5,819
Hamilton	1,174	5,108
Hardee	2,342	5,965
Hendry	3,683	6,996
Hernando	2,324	5,934
Highlands	2,668	6,327
Hillsborough	2,482	5,940
Holmes	1,082	4,972
Indian River	2,242	5,736
Jackson	742	5,839
Jefferson	1,317	5,135
Lafayette	2,324	6,329
Lake	2,632	6,120

TABLE 37--Continued

County	Gross Local Level of Financial Support[a]	Gross Level of Financial Support[b]
Lee	$2,618	$6,243
Leon	1,360	5,194
Levy	1,935	5,638
Liberty	1,931	5,995
Madison	948	4,832
Manatee	2,207	5,699
Marion	1,807	5,545
Martin	3,437	7,014
Monroe	3,442	9,206
Nassau	2,259	5,918
Okaloosa	558	6,148
Okeechobee	3,204	7,251
Orange	2,438	6,373
Osceola	2,710	6,320
Palm Beach	3,049	7,232
Pasco	1,934	5,446
Pinellas	4,294	8,406
Polk	2,780	6,129
Putnam	2,548	6,180
St. Johns	2,073	5,251
St. Lucie	2,465	6,069
Santa Rosa	1,148	5,755
Sarasota	3,205	6,672
Seminole	1,999	5,691
Sumter	1,572	5,240
Suwannee	1,264	4,876
Taylor	2,060	5,585
Union	2,127	5,772
Volusia	3,070	6,431
Wakulla	1,671	5,952
Walton	998	4,979
Washington	907	4,769
State	2,893	6,666

Source: Biennial Report of Superintendent of Public Instruction, 1954-56 (Tallahassee: State Department of Education, 1957), pp. 184-191, 196-199.

[a]Includes all funds from county and district sources and also Racing Commission funds. These funds represent monies subject to local choice and action.

[b]Includes the aggregate of funds from all sources.

the state was $2,893 per unit of educational load. Gross local level
of support combines the local required contribution for participation
in the state foundation program, local financial initiative by the
several counties, and local prerogative relative to the use of certain
state collected taxes.

Local School Tax Levies in Florida

In Florida the local school tax levy is determined by two
methods: (1) the school board can legally set the county-wide school
tax at a level between three and ten mills, and (2) the freeholders
by vote in a biennial district election determine the district school
tax within a ten mill maximum. The combined school tax has a maximum
of 20 mills. Table 38 shows the distribution of Florida counties ac-
cording to total school tax levy for 1956. Thirty-four counties, over

TABLE 38

ACTUAL SCHOOL TAX LEVY IN FLORIDA COUNTIES FOR 1956

Millage Levy	Per Cent of Consti- tutional Limit	Number of Counties
20	100	26
19	95	8
18	90	6
17	85	4
16	80	6
15	75	5
14	70	3
13	65	7
12	60	2

Source: Biennial Report Superintendent of Public Instruction,
1954-56 (Tallahassee: State Department of Education, 1957), pp. 284-
285.

one-half of the counties in Florida, were levying 19 to 20 mills
on the assessed valuation of non-exempt property. Forty-four coun-
ties, nearly two-thirds of the counties in Florida, were levying
17 to 20 mills on the assessed valuation of non-exempt property.
These data indicate a tendency toward high millage levies for most
of the counties in Florida.

The Florida foundation program has an established base
millage levy for participation in the program. Review of the formu-
lae defined in the state foundation program law (Florida Statutes,
sec. 236.07) reveals the significance of required millage levies
for participation in the state foundation program. The formulae
given below show how the individual county required contribution
for participation in the state foundation program is calculated.
The required county contribution for participation in the state
foundation program can then be used to determine the required tax
levy for the county if the county wishes to participate in the
state foundation program. The formulae are as follows:

1. county index of tax-   x   aggregate assessed   =   equalised asses-
   paying ability   valuation of non-   sed valuation of
                                  exempt property   non-exempt proper-
                                  for the state   ty in the county

2. equalized assessed   x   (.006)(.95)   =   required local funds for
   valuation of non-   participation in the
   exempt property in   state foundation program
   the county

3. required local funds for participa-
   tion in the state foundation program   =   required tax levy for
   assessed valuation of non-exempt   participation in the
   property in the county   state foundation program

---

[2]Required millage levy for participation in the state foundation

Table 39 shows the number of counties in which the required tax
levy for participation in the state foundation program was less than
six mills for selected years. The factors of the index of taxpaying
ability were revised in 1953,[3] therefore the data for 1953 and 1956
are based upon the same factors and the same weighting of factors.
The data for 1947 were based upon a different index of taxpaying
ability with different factors and different weighting of factors.
These data indicate 45 counties demonstrated below average assess-
ment practice in 1947. Twenty-two counties demonstrated above
average assessment practice in 1947. Fifty-four counties demon-
strated below average assessment practice in 1953 and 1956. Thir-
teen counties demonstrated above average assessment practice in 1953
and 1956. Table 40 shows the number of counties in which the re-
quired tax levy for participation in the state foundation program
increased or decreased between the years 1947 and 1956 and between
the years 1953 and 1956. The data for the span of time between 1947

---

program refers only to the minimum local contribution. This amount
is required of the county if the county wishes to participate in the
state foundation program; no county is required to participate in the
state foundation program, however, all 67 counties do participate.

[3]The factors in the 1947 index of taxpaying ability were:
(1) assessed valuation of railroad and telegraph property, (2) value
of farm products, (3) automobile license tag sales, (4) assessed valua-
tion of non-exempt property exclusive of railroad and telegraph proper-
ty, (5) retail sales volume, (6) consumer purchasing power (affective
buying income). The factors in the current index of taxpaying ability
are: (1) sales tax returns, (2) value of farm products, (3) gainfully
employed workers less government and farm workers, (4) assessed valua-
tion of railroad and telegraph property, and (5) automobile license
tag sales.

TABLE 39

REQUIRED TAX LEVY FOR PARTICIPATION IN THE STATE FOUNDATION PROGRAM
FOR THE YEARS: 1947, 1953, and 1956

Required Millage Levy	Number of Counties		
	1947	1953	1956
Below six mills	22	13	13
Above six mills	45	54	54

Source: "Application of Index of Taxpaying Ability," Talla-
hassee: State Department of Education: 1947; 1953; 1956.

TABLE 40

NUMBER OF COUNTIES IN WHICH THE REQUIRED TAX LEVY FOR PARTICIPATION
IN THE STATE FOUNDATION PROGRAM CHANGED BETWEEN 1947 and 1956
AND BETWEEN 1953 AND 1956

Direction of Change in Tax Rate	Number of Counties Having Change	
	Between 1947 and 1956	Between 1953 and 1956
Decrease in required tax rate	18	29
Increase in required tax rate	48	38
No change	1	—

Source: "Application of Index of Taxpaying Ability," Talla-
hassee: State Department of Education: 1947, p. 1; 1953, p. 1;
1956, p. 1.

and 1956 are affected by the use of two different indices of tax-
paying ability. Between 1947 and 1956, 48 counties showed an increase
in required tax levy, while 18 counties showed a decrease in required
tax levy. Between 1953 and 1956, 38 counties showed an increase in
required tax levy, while 29 counties showed a decrease in required
tax levy.

In summary, a majority of the counties in Florida are at
or are close to the constitutional limit of 20 mills. When the
counties are examined in relation to required tax levies for par-
ticipation in the state foundation program the evidence indicates
a majority of the counties demonstrate below average assessment
practice. Tax levies as discussed in this section appear inadequate
as a measure of local effort.

Relating Local School Tax Revenue to Aggregate Personal Income and Personal Income Per Capita

Table 41 shows aggregate personal income of each of the
eight groups of counties as a per cent of the aggregate personal
income of the state and aggregate local school tax revenue of each
of the eight groups of counties as a per cent of the aggregate local
school tax revenue for the state. These data indicate a similarity
between the distribution of aggregate personal income and aggregate
local school tax revenue in the several groups of counties. Table
42 shows the ratio of local school tax revenue to aggregate personal
income for the several counties in Florida. These data indicate
a variation from .55 to 2.44 or a range of 1.89. The average for
the state was 1.15.

TABLE 41

AGGREGATE PERSONAL INCOME OF EACH OF THE EIGHT GROUPS OF COUNTIES AS A
PER CENT OF THE AGGREGATE PERSONAL INCOME OF THE STATE AND
AGGREGATE LOCAL SCHOOL TAX REVENUE OF EACH OF THE EIGHT
GROUPS OF COUNTIES AS A PER CENT OF THE AGGREGATE
LOCAL SCHOOL TAX REVENUE FOR THE STATE

Personal Income Per Capita[a]	Aggregate Personal Income[b]	Local School Tax Revenue[c]
$2,000 and over	24.56%	31.77%
$1,800 to $2,000	21.55	15.16
$1,600 to $1,800	29.47	29.56
$1,400 to $1,600	13.14	12.39
$1,200 to $1,400	7.46	7.61
$1,000 to $1,200	2.10	1.73
$ 800 to $1,000	1.29	1.24
$ 600 to $ 800	.43	.54
Total	100.00	100.00

[a]For grouping of counties see Table 15.

[b]From data presented in Table 22.

[c]Source: Biennial Report of Superintendent of Public Instruction, 1954-56 (Tallahassee: State Department of Education, 1957), pp. 188-191, 196-197.

TABLE 42

RATIO OF LOCAL SCHOOL TAX REVENUE[a] TO AGGREGATE PERSONAL INCOME[b] IN
THE FLORIDA COUNTIES

County	Ratio	County	Ratio
Alachua	1.36	Indian River	1.06
Baker	1.09	Jackson	.64
Bay	.82	Jefferson	.93
Bradford	.97	Lafayette	.96
Brevard	.66	Lake	1.25
Broward	1.45	Lee	1.15
Calhoun	.79	Leon	.73
Charlotte	1.52	Levy	1.20
Citrus	1.69	Liberty	.72
Clay	.74	Madison	.75
Collier	1.40	Manatee	1.38
Columbia	1.00	Marion	1.28
Dade	1.52	Martin	1.29
DeSoto	.85	Monroe	.90
Dixie	2.44	Nassau	1.63
Duval	.78	Okaloosa	1.69
Escambia	.62	Okeechobee	2.13
Flagler	1.10	Orange	.91
Franklin	2.53	Osceola	1.53
Gadsden	.55	Palm Beach	.99
Gilchrist	1.67	Pasco	1.10
Glades	1.48	Pinellas	1.53
Gulf	1.11	Polk	1.28
Hamilton	.70	Putnam	1.62
Hardee	1.14	St. Johns	.78
Hendry	1.05	St. Lucie	1.07
Hernando	1.08	Santa Rosa	.55
Highlands	1.39	Sarasota	1.02
Hillsborough	1.04	Seminole	1.21
Holmes	1.13	Sumter	1.21

TABLE 42--Continued

County	Ratio	County	Ratio
Suwannee	1.02	Walton	.95
Taylor	1.12	Washington	.71
Union	.56		
Volusia	1.51	State	1.15
Wakulla	.93		

[a]Source: Biennial Report Superintendent of Public Instruction, 1954-56 (Tallahassee: State Department of Education, 1957), pp. 188-191, 196-197.

[b]Source: Wylie Kilpatrick, "Personal Income Received in Florida Counties: 1956," Economic Leaflets, XXV, No. 4 (May, 1958), p. 2.

In summary, local school tax revenue demonstrates a close relationship to aggregate personal income per capita. When the counties are examined individually the ratios show wide variation. These data indicate some of the variation in local effort toward the support of schools.

Relating Assessed Valuation of
Non-Exempt Property and Equal-
ized Assessed Valuation of
Non-Exempt Property to
Personal Income Per Capita

The ratio of assessed valuation of non-exempt property to equalized assessed valuation of non-exempt property represents a measure of local assessment practice. Table 43 shows the assessed valuation of non-exempt property, equalized assessed valuation of non-exempt property, and the ratio of assessed valuation of non-exempt property to equalized assessed valuation of non-exempt property when the Florida counties are grouped according to personal income per capita. Counties with personal income per capita "$2,000 and over" and counties with personal income per capita "$1,600 to $1,800" show the highest ratios between the two measures of assessed valuation of property. The remaining 52 counties demonstrate a high degree of similarity in the ratio between the two measures of assessed valuation of property. Table 44 shows the ratio of assessed valuation of non-exempt property to equalized assessed valuation of non-exempt property for the several counties in Florida. These data show a variation from .36 to 1.82 or a range of 1.46. The ratio for the

TABLE 43

ASSESSED VALUATION OF NON-EXEMPT PROPERTY AND EQUALIZED ASSESSED VALUATION OF NON-EXEMPT PROPERTY IN THE
EIGHT CATEGORIES OF PERSONAL INCOME PER CAPITA WHEN THE FLORIDA COUNTIES ARE GROUPED ACCORDING TO
PERSONAL INCOME PER CAPITA AND RATIO OF ASSESSED VALUATION OF NON-EXEMPT PROPERTY TO EQUALIZED
ASSESSED VALUATION OF NON-EXEMPT PROPERTY FOR EACH CATEGORY OF PERSONAL INCOME PER CAPITA

Personal Income Per Capita[a]	Assessed Valuation of Non-Exempt Property[b]	Equalized Assessed Valuation of Non-Exempt Property[c]	Ratio of Assessed Valuation of Non-Exempt Property to Equalized Assessed Valuation of Non-Exempt Property
$2,000 and over	$1,232,896,499	$ 940,791,600	1.31
$1,800 to $2,000	589,028,055	732,159,873	.80
$1,600 to $1,800	1,258,879,142	1,226,227,764	1.03
$1,400 to $1,600	521,048,000	583,337,656	.89
$1,200 to $1,400	275,791,680	320,092,568	.86
$1,000 to $1,200	68,542,970	110,695,337	.71
$ 800 to $1,000	59,472,660	84,079,341	.71
$ 600 to $ 800	20,358,168	28,633,035	.71
State	4,026,017,174	4,026,017,174	1.00

[a]For grouping of counties see Table 8.

[b]Data from Table 15.

[c]Derived from data presented in Table 26.

TABLE 44

RATIO OF ASSESSED VALUATION OF NON-EXEMPT PROPERTY[a] TO EQUALIZED
ASSESSED VALUATION OF NON-EXEMPT PROPERTY[b] IN
THE FLORIDA COUNTIES

County	Ratio	County	Ratio
Alachua	.84	Indian River	.92
Baker	.53	Jackson	.44
Bay	.80	Jefferson	.74
Bradford	.53	Lafayette	.90
Brevard	.75	Lake	.89
Broward	1.49	Lee	.71
Calhoun	.49	Leon	.94
Charlotte	1.11	Levy	.85
Citrus	1.05	Liberty	.71
Clay	.88	Madison	.59
Collier	1.26	Manatee	.73
Columbia	.64	Marion	.79
Dade	1.32	Martin	1.30
DeSoto	.51	Monroe	1.53
Dixie	1.82	Nassau	.91
Duval	.77	Okaloosa	.37
Escambia	.58	Okeechobee	.86
Flagler	.73	Orange	.72
Franklin	1.29	Osceola	.88
Gadsden	.46	Palm Beach	.95
Gilchrist	.67	Pasco	.59
Glades	.85	Pinellas	1.39
Gulf	.94	Polk	.93
Hamilton	.50	Putnam	1.21
Hardee	.51	St. Johns	.56
Hendry	.80	St. Lucie	.72
Hernando	.82	Santa Rosa	.45
Highlands	.99	Sarasota	.67
Hillsborough	.88	Seminole	.83
Holmes	.57	Sumter	.45

TABLE 44--Continued

County	Ratio	County	Ratio
Suwannee	.75	Walton	.53
Taylor	.73	Washington	.46
Union	.41		
Volusia	1.02		
Wakulla	.85	State	1.00

[a]Source: Report of the Comptroller of the State of Florida (Tallahassee: Office of Comptroller, 1955), pp. 66-67.

[b]From Table 26.

state was 1.00 since both measures were based on the same aggregate.
Twelve counties had a ratio over 1.00 and one county had a ratio
of .99. These data are consistent with the data cited in Table 38
concerning required tax levy for participation in the state founda-
tion program. A ratio greater than 1.00 causes the required tax
levy for participation in the state foundation program to be less
than six mills. A ratio less than 1.00 causes the required tax
levy for participation in the state foundation program to be greater
than six mills. The ratio of assessed valuation of non-exempt
property to equalized assessed valuation of non-exempt property
can directly affect the amount of local tax effort. Data presented
in Table 38 indicated a majority of the counties are approaching
the constitutional maximum tax levy. Data presented in Table 42
indicated a majority of the counties have a ratio of assessed valua-
tion of non-exempt property to equalized assessed valuation of non-
exempt property which is less than 1.00. The range between the
required tax levy for participation in the state foundation program
and the constitutional maximum school tax levy is progressively
reduced as the ratio of assessed valuation of non-exempt property
to equalized assessed valuation of non-exempt property decreases.
Also the revenue per mill of tax is reduced as the ratio of assessed
valuation of non-exempt property to equalized assessed valuation of
non-exempt property decreases.

The Measure of Tax Effort

For purposes in this study local tax effort for the support of schools was limited to the local school funds which the people in the counties raise through the levy of school taxes. Extraneous sources of local revenue from interest, tuition, and miscellaneous sources were not included. Local school tax funds represent the local financial burden assumed for the support of schools.

Local financial ability as calculated in Chapter III was based upon equalized assessed valuation of non-exempt property. Local school tax revenue as defined in the present chapter represents the aggregate of revenue from the two local school tax levies. Local effort was calculated as the ratio of local school tax revenue to equalized assessed valuation of non-exempt property, based on the formula suggested by Mort and Reusser[4] and used in many studies of local effort. The ratio was expressed in mills. These data indicate a variation from 6.3 mills to 26.3 mills or a range of 20 mills. The tax effort for the state was 18.8 mills.

Summary

The purpose in this chapter was to measure local tax effort toward the support of schools. Revenue from the several sources were examined. The varying methods for the distribution of school funds were indicated.

---

[4] Paul R. Mort and Walter C. Reusser, Public School Finance (second edition; New York: McGraw Hill Book Company, Inc., 1951), p. 509.

TABLE 45

COUNTY TAX EFFORT BASED UPON THE RATIO OF LOCAL SCHOOL TAX REVENUE[a] TO
EQUALIZED ASSESSED VALUATION OF NON-EXEMPT PROPERTY[b]

County	Tax Effort[c]	County	Tax Effort[c]
Alachua	20.1 mills	Hendry	18.0 mills
Baker	9.6	Hernando	11.0
Bay	15.3	Highlands	19.4
Bradford	9.0	Hillsborough	16.6
Brevard	18.9	Holmes	11.0
Broward	23.5	Indian River	14.9
Calhoun	9.2	Jackson	9.2
Charlotte	16.7	Jefferson	9.4
Citrus	11.9	Lafayette	11.3
Clay	14.5	Lake	18.2
Collier	25.4	Lee	15.8
Columbia	12.6	Leon	13.0
Dade	26.3	Levy	11.5
DeSoto	10.7	Liberty	8.2
Dixie	21.8	Madison	8.5
Duval	15.3	Manatee	17.2
Escambia	13.4	Marion	15.7
Flagler	9.8	Martin	17.3
Franklin	24.8	Monroe	24.4
Gadsden	9.8	Nassau	18.7
Gilchrist	13.9	Okaloosa	6.9
Glades	16.3	Okeechobee	20.6
Gulf	18.7	Orange	16.0
Hamilton	7.9	Osceola	15.3
Hardee	14.5	Palm Beach	16.7

TABLE 45—Continued

County	Tax Effort[c]	County	Tax Effort[c]
Pasco	12.3 mills	Suwannee	11.5 mills
Pinellas	21.9	Taylor	12.6
Polk	19.6	Union	6.3
Putnam	24.0	Volusia	18.2
St. Johns	10.0	Wakulla	9.7
St. Lucie	15.4	Walton	10.2
Santa Rosa	11.4	Washington	9.2
Sarasota	14.6		
Seminole	16.0	State	18.8
Sumter	10.6		

[a]Source: Biennial Report Superintendent of Public Instruction, 1954-56 (Tallahassee: State Department of Education, 1957), pp. 188-191, 196-197.

[b]Data from Table 26.

[c]County tax effort computed as follows:

$$\frac{\text{county school tax revenue}}{\text{county equalized assessed valuation of non-exempt property}} \times 1{,}000 = \text{county tax effort in mills.}$$

Two measures of the results of financial support were identified: (1) gross level of financial support, and (2) gross local level of financial support. Gross level of financial support indicates the aggregate funds for support of education per unit of educational load. Gross local level of financial support indicates the total amount of local school tax funds, funds subject to local discretion, and miscellaneous local revenue per unit of educational load.

Actual tax levies by the counties were examined. Required tax levies for participation in the state foundation program were examined. The actual tax levies and the required tax levies for participation in the state foundation program were examined in relation to the ratio of assessed valuation of non-exempt property to equalized assessed valuation of non-exempt property. The relationship indicates a constricting effect on tax effort in the following manner: (1) low assessment ratio increases the required millage for participation in the foundation program thus reducing available millage for local effort, and (2) low assessment ratio reduces the dollar tax revenue from each mill levied.

Local tax effort was measured as the ratio of local school tax revenue to equalized assessed valuation of non-exempt property. Local tax effort was expressed in terms of the number of mills which would be required to raise the existing local school tax revenue based on an equalized assessed valuation of non-exempt property.

CHAPTER V

LOCAL FINANCIAL INITIATIVE IN THE
SUPPORT OF EDUCATION

The purpose of the state foundation program is to provide
an acceptable minimum education program for the several school
districts. Each county is encouraged to supplement the local school
program with additional funds in order to provide enrichment beyond
the acceptable minimum program. The local supplement to the founda-
tion program is in general the result of additional tax effort in
the county. The people assume an additional tax burden in order
to provide more funds for the support of the local school program.
In this study the additional tax burden beyond the local tax required
for participation in the state foundation program is called local
financial initiative. It is the purpose in this chapter to measure
the amount of local financial initiative made in the several counties
in Florida.

Local Tax Support for Education
in Florida

Local tax funds for the support of education are derived
from the following sources: (1) county school taxes, and (2) dis-
trict school taxes. County school taxes are derived from school
taxes levied on the assessed valuation of non-exempt property.
School district taxes are derived from school taxes levied on the

134

assessed valuation of non-exempt property in the school district.

Florida Statutes define the county and the school district as follows:

> On and after January 1, 1948, all school districts and all territory not included in school districts in each county of the state, shall be consolidated in each county into one school district to be known as "Special Tax School District Number 1," and the boundaries of said "Special Tax School District Number 1," shall be coextensive with the boundaries of the county and subject to all general laws relative to school districts.[1]

The county school tax and the district school tax are derived from levies on the assessed valuation of the same parcels of property since the county and the school district are coterminous. School tax is levied against homestead exempt property in nine counties to retire debts against the property of certain old school tax districts in which bonded indebtedness had been contracted before the passage of the homestead exemption law.

Florida collected $76,717,693.34 in local school taxes for the school year 1955-56. These receipts represent monies collected from tax levies against property and does not include excess fees, interest on investments, philanthropic receipts, and other incidental local school funds. The required local contribution for participation in the state foundation program is determined in the following manner:

> The amount which each county shall provide toward the cost of the minimum foundation program is that county's per cent of the financial ability of the state as determined by an index of taxpaying ability prescribed by law multiplied by ninety-five per cent of the calculated yield of six

---

[1]Florida, Revised Statutes (1957), sec. 236.34 (1).

mills of taxes levied on the non-exempt assessed valuation
of the state. . . .[2]

The aggregate required local contribution for participation in the
state foundation program was $21,234,264.00 for the school year
1955-56. The additional charge of 5 per cent for kindergarten and
5 per cent for junior college in counties which have established
one or both of these programs increase the total required contri-
bution for the several counties to $21,677,389.00.

Aggregate local school tax revenue minus the required con-
tribution for participation in the state foundation program leaves
the amount of local school tax funds in excess of the required
local contribution to the state foundation program. Local school
tax funds in excess of the required contribution to the state founda-
tion program for the school year 1955-56 amounted to $55,483,429.34.
The several counties in Florida taxed themselves sufficiently to
raise $55,483,429.34 in excess of the $21,234,264.00 required local
contribution. Local school tax funds for the 1955-56 school year
were over 250 per cent of the required local contribution for par-
ticipation in the state foundation program.

Table 46 shows local school tax funds for the support of
education, required local funds for participation in the state
foundation program,[3] and local school tax funds in excess of the
required local funds for participation in the state foundation program.

---

[2]Ibid., sec. 236.07 (8).

[3]Required local contribution for participation in the state
foundation program as used in this study does not include the extra
5 per cent for kindergarten and 5 per cent for junior college.

TABLE 46

LOCAL SCHOOL TAX REVENUE, REQUIRED LOCAL FUNDS FOR PARTICIPATION IN
STATE FOUNDATION PROGRAM, AND LOCAL SCHOOL TAX FUNDS IN EXCESS
OF LOCAL CONTRIBUTION TO STATE FOUNDATION PROGRAM

County	Local School Tax Funds[a]	Local Contribution to State Foundation Program[b]	Local School Tax Funds in Excess of Local Contribution to State Foundation Program[c]
Alachua	$ 1,114,684.82	$ 296,918.00	$ 817,766.82
Baker	60,060.60	33,256.00	26,804.60
Bay	693,241.07	240,906.00	452,336.07
Bradford	93,363.25	55,219.00	38,144.25
Brevard	677,161.90	212,201.00	464,960.90
Broward	4,833,073.61	1,095,525.00	3,737,548.61
Calhoun	41,135.80	23,830.00	17,305.80
Charlotte	114,687.68	36,476.00	78,211.68
Citrus	104,073.67	46,613.00	57,460.67
Clay	168,288.01	61,895.00	106,393.01
Collier	328,340.75	69,066.00	259,274.75
Columbia	217,035.47	91,888.00	125,147.47
Dade	24,405,547.46	4,714,353.00	19,691,194.46
DeSoto	106,854.27	53,197.00	53,657.27
Dixie	75,936.50	19,973.00	55,963.50
Duval	6,208,818.54	2,162,755.00	4,046,063.54
Escambia	1,668,378.68	661,526.00	1,006,852.68
Flagler	76,057.60	43,304.00	32,753.60
Franklin	110,044.42	23,595.00	86,449.42
Gadsden	259,251.68	140,730.00	118,521.68
Gilchrist	47,818.84	18,356.00	29,462.84
Glades	66,881.94	21,877.00	45,004.94
Gulf	171,621.25	49,104.00	122,072.25
Hamilton	51,780.56	34,952.00	16,828.56
Hardee	174,994.35	64,214.00	110,780.35
Hendry	218,094.46	64,686.00	153,408.46
Hernando	106,831.26	47,876.00	58,955.26
Highlands	378,460.40	103,889.00	274,571.40
Hillsborough	5,507,189.91	1,773,842.00	3,733,347.91
Holmes	87,248.23	42,444.00	44,804.23

TABLE 46--Continued

County	Local School Tax Funds[a]	Local Contribution to State Foundation Program[b]	Local School Tax Funds in Excess of Local Contribution to State Foundation Program[c]
Indian River	$ 291,119.52	$ 104,512.00	$ 186,607.52
Jackson	238,676.87	139,098.00	99,578.87
Jefferson	82,075.45	46,652.00	35,423.45
Lafayette	29,210.19	13,848.00	15,362.19
Lake	1,012,747.57	295,501.00	717,246.57
Lee	622,134.28	210,526.00	411,608.28
Leon	688,893.31	281,760.00	407,133.31
Levy	117,114.23	54,403.00	62,711.23
Liberty	17,691.57	11,550.00	6,141.57
Madison	96,879.65	60,629.00	36,250.65
Manatee	814,538.08	252,188.00	562,350.08
Marion	763,499.35	259,005.00	504,496.35
Martin	225,993.71	69,538.00	156,455.71
Monroe	691,526.09	151,014.00	540,512.09
Nassau	321,020.83	91,372.00	229,648.83
Okaloosa	147,614.74	114,065.00	33,549.74
Okeechobee	96,591.89	24,947.00	71,644.89
Orange	3,161,202.86	1,052,287.00	2,108,915.86
Osceola	199,087.09	69,367.00	129,720.09
Palm Beach	3,298,817.53	1,053,510.00	2,245,307.53
Pasco	364,154.56	157,927.00	206,227.56
Pinellas	5,816,732.36	1,414,835.00	4,401,897.36
Polk	3,695,780.26	1,004,432.00	2,691,348.26
Putnam	632,195.76	140,322.00	491,873.76
St. Johns	352,468.35	187,747.00	164,721.35
St. Lucie	457,602.41	157,948.00	299,654.41
Santa Rosa	126,820.48	59,404.00	67,416.48
Sarasota	861,606.65	314,179.00	547,427.65
Seminole	530,896.02	177,099.00	353,797.02
Sumter	133,627.24	67,413.00	66,214.24

TABLE 46--Continued

County	Local School Tax Funds[a]	Local Contribution to State Foundation Program[b]	Local School Tax Funds in Excess of Local Contribution to State Foundation Program[c]
Suwannee	$ 172,187.85	$ 79,865.00	$ 92,322.85
Taylor	180,877.37	76,516.00	104,361.37
Union	21,745.28	18,378.00	3,367.28
Volusia	2,076,612.72	608,907.00	1,467,705.72
Wakulla	29,509.98	16,188.00	13,321.98
Walton	110,158.12	57,816.00	52,340.12
Washington	60,775.50	35,165.00	25,614.50
State	76,717,693.34	21,234,264.00	55,483,429.34

[a]Source: Biennial Report Superintendent of Public Instruction, 1954-56 (Tallahassee: State Department of Education, 1957), pp. 188-191, 196-197.

[b]Source: "Application of Index of Taxpaying Ability, 1955-56," (Tallahassee: State Department of Education, 1955).

[c]These funds represent the difference between local school tax funds and required local funds for participation in the state foundation program.

Table 47 shows local school tax funds in excess of the required con-
tribution for participation in the state foundation program per unit
of educational load for the several counties in Florida. These data
indicate a variation from $69.00 to $4,495.00 or a range of $4,462.00.
The average for the state was $1,920.00. Local school tax funds in
excess of the required contribution for participation in the state
foundation program represent the gross result of local financial
initiative distributed according to educational load.

Relating Funds from Local Initiative
to Local Ability and Local Tax Effort

In Chapter III local financial ability was calculated as the
amount of equalized assessed valuation of non-exempt property per
unit of educational load. In Chapter IV local financial effort was
calculated as the ratio in mills of local school tax revenue to equal-
ized assessed valuation of non-exempt property. In the present chap-
ter the result of local financial initiative was measured as local
school tax funds in excess of the required contribution for partici-
pation in the state foundation program per unit of educational load.
It is the purpose in this section to examine the relationship of the
three measures.

Three counties were selected which produced about the same
number of dollars in local tax funds in excess of the required con-
tribution for participation in the state foundation program per unit
of educational load. Table 48 shows the three counties and the three
quantified measures. The three counties with about the same dollar

TABLE 47

LOCAL SCHOOL TAX FUNDS IN EXCESS OF LOCAL CONTRIBUTION TO STATE
FOUNDATION PROGRAM[a] PER UNIT OF EDUCATIONAL LOAD[b]

County	Dollars Per Unit of Load	County	Dollars Per Unit of Load
Alachua	$1,402.00	Indian River	$1,348.00
Baker	339.00	Jackson	212.00
Bay	857.00	Jefferson	270.00
Bradford	254.00	Lafayette	366.00
Brevard	1,220.00	Lake	1,737.00
Broward	3,256.00	Lee	1,517.00
Calhoun	145.00	Leon	713.00
Charlotte	2,235.00	Levy	458.00
Citrus	736.00	Liberty	125.00
Clay	782.00	Madison	205.00
Collier	2,673.00	Manatee	1,441.00
Columbia	546.00	Marion	1,076.00
Dade	4,495.00	Martin	1,719.00
DeSoto	654.00	Monroe	1,410.00
Dixie	1,976.00	Nassau	1,269.00
Duval	1,428.00	Okaloosa	95.00
Escambia	769.00	Okeechobee	1,524.00
Flagler	712.00	Orange	1,603.00
Franklin	1,351.00	Osceola	1,235.00
Gadsden	342.00	Palm Beach	2,028.00
Gilchrist	562.00	Pasco	885.00
Glades	1,555.00	Pinellas	3,173.00
Gulf	1,125.00	Polk	1,870.00
Hamilton	134.00	Putnam	1,802.00
Hardee	963.00	St. Johns	811.00
Hendry	2,256.00	St. Lucie	1,344.00
Hernando	746.00	Santa Rosa	282.00
Highlands	1,587.00	Sarasota	1,620.00
Hillsborough	1,593.00	Seminole	1,291.00
Holmes	275.00	Sumter	476.00

TABLE 47--Continued

County	Dollars Per Unit of Load	County	Dollars Per Unit of Load
Suwannee	$ 466.00	Walton	$ 281.00
Taylor	797.00	Washington	168.00
Union	69.00		
Volusia	1,983.00	State	1,920.00
Wakulla	185.00		

[a]Data from Table 46.

[b]Data from Table 26.

TABLE 48

COMPARISON OF THE RESULT OF LOCAL INITIATIVE, LOCAL FINANCIAL ABILITY
AND LOCAL FINANCIAL EFFORT IN THREE SELECTED COUNTIES

County	Dollar Result of Local Initiative[a]	Local Ability[b]	Local Effort[c]
Franklin	$1,351.00	$ 3,759.00	24.8 mills
St. Lucie	1,344.00	5,725.00	15.4
Indian River	1,348.00	6,361.00	14.9

[a]Data from Table 46.

[b]Data from Table 32.

[c]Data from Table 45.

result of local initiative demonstrate over 100 per cent differ-
ence in local ability. The three counties with approximately the
same dollar result of local initiative demonstrated approximately
60 per cent difference in local tax effort. The 100 per cent
difference in local ability and the 60 per cent difference in
local effort can be explained by examining the characteristics
of the two measures. Local financial ability relates equalized
assessed valuation of non-exempt property to educational load.
Local tax effort relates local school tax revenue to equalized
assessed valuation of non-exempt property without consideration
of educational load. Local tax effort as defined in this study
includes both the tax effort required for participation in the
state foundation program and that effort assumed for enriching
the local educational program. The next step in this study is
to calculate a measure of local financial initiative.

Measuring Local Financial Initiative

The rationale for measuring local financial initiative should
logically be the same as was used for measuring local financial
effort. Local financial effort was measured in mills based upon
the ratio of local school tax revenue to equalized assessed valua-
tion of non-exempt property. Local financial initiative as defined
in this study should also be measured as a tax levy. The tax levy
for local initiative should be based upon the ratio of local school
tax funds in excess of the required contribution for participation

in the state foundation program to equalized assessed valuation of non-exempt property.[4] Table 49 shows local initiative for the several counties based upon the above formula. These data indicate a variation from .3 mills to 20.3 mills or a range of 20.0 mills. The average for the state was 12.2 mills.[5]

Table 50 shows three counties which exerted the same amount of local initiative. Selected measures were shown in relation to initiative to indicate some of the results of initiative under varying economic conditions. Osceola County exerting local initiative of 9.3 mills with 105 educational load units and local ability of $123,804.00, provided $1,235.00 per unit of educational load as a result of the 9.3 mills local initiative. Duval County exerting local initiative of 9.3 mills with 2,834 educational load units and local ability of $143,122.00, provided $1,428.00 per unit of educational load as a result of the 9.3 mills local initiative. Bay County exerting local initiative of 9.3 mills with 528 educational load units and local ability of $85,598.00 provided $857.00 per unit of educational load as a result of 9.3 mills local initiative. Local financial initiative represents the tax effort based

---

[4]Certain items budgeted as "general control" are not included in the state foundation program, yet these costs absorb local funds. In this study all local school tax funds are considered without regard for inclusion in the state foundation program.

[5]Local effort and local initiative as measured in this study demonstrate the same range. The required contribution for participation in the state foundation program is equivalent to six mills; therefore, six mills deducted from local effort would produce the millage of local initiative.

TABLE 49

COUNTY TAX INITIATIVE BASED UPON THE RATIO OF LOCAL SCHOOL TAX FUNDS IN
EXCESS OF REQUIRED LOCAL CONTRIBUTION FOR PARTICIPATION IN THE STATE
FOUNDATION PROGRAM[a] TO EQUALIZED ASSESSED VALUATION
OF NON-EXEMPT PROPERTY[b]

County	Local Initiative[c]	County	Local Initiative[c]
Alachua	14.1 mills	Indian River	8.9 mills
Baker	3.6	Jackson	3.2
Bay	9.3	Jefferson	3.4
Bradford	3.0	Lafayette	5.3
Brevard	12.9	Lake	12.2
Broward	17.5	Lee	9.8
Calhoun	3.2	Leon	7.0
Charlotte	10.7	Levy	5.5
Citrus	5.9	Liberty	2.2
Clay	8.5	Madison	2.5
Collier	19.4	Manatee	11.2
Columbia	6.6	Marion	9.7
Dade	20.3	Martin	11.3
DeSoto	4.7	Monroe	18.4
Dixie	15.8	Nassau	12.7
Duval	9.3	Okaloosa	.9
Escambia	7.4	Okeechobee	14.6
Flagler	3.8	Orange	10.0
Franklin	18.8	Osceola	9.3
Gadsden	3.8	Palm Beach	10.7
Gilchrist	7.9	Pasco	6.3
Glades	10.3	Pinellas	15.9
Gulf	12.7	Polk	13.6
Hamilton	1.9	Putnam	18.0
Hardee	8.5	St. Johns	4.0
Hendry	12.0	St. Lucie	9.4
Hernando	5.9	Santa Rosa	5.4
Highlands	13.4	Sarasota	8.6
Hillsborough	10.6	Seminole	10.0
Holmes	5.0	Sumter	4.6

TABLE 49--Continued

County	Local Initiative[c]	County	Local Initiative[c]
Suwannee	5.5 mills	Walton	4.2 mills
Taylor	6.6	Washington	3.2
Union	.3		
Volusia	12.2	State	12.8
Wakulla	3.7		

[a]Data from Table 46.

[b]Data from Table 26.

[c]County millage tax initiative computed as follows:

$$\frac{\text{local school tax revenue in excess of state foundation program contribution}}{\text{county equalized assessed valuation of non-exempt property}} \times 1,000 = \text{county tax initiative in mills}$$

TABLE 50

COMPARISON OF LOCAL INITIATIVE, LOCAL ABILITY, EDUCATIONAL LOAD, AND THE RESULT OF LOCAL INITIATIVE IN SELECTED COUNTIES

County	Local Initiative[a]	Local Ability[b]	Educational Load[c]	Dollar Effect of Local Initiative[d]
Bay	9.3	$ 85,598.00	528	$ 857.00
Duval	9.3	143,122.00	2,834	1,428.00
Osceola	9.3	123,804.00	105	1,235.00

[a]Data from Table 49.

[b]Data from Table 32.

[c]Data from Table 28.

[d]Data from Table 47.

upon equalized assessed valuation of non-exempt property. The
dollar result of local initiative is dependent in part upon educa-
tional load and upon the tax base against which the tax is levied.

Summary

The legal basis and sources of local school tax revenue
were examined. The required local contribution to the state founda-
tion program was deducted from local school tax revenue in order
to reveal the amount of local money raised in excess of the contri-
bution to the state foundation program. Local school tax funds in
excess of the state foundation program contribution was distributed
in relation to educational load in order to measure the effect of
local initiative.

Local initiative was calculated as a ratio of local school
tax funds in excess of required contribution for participation in
the state foundation program to equalized assessed valuation of non-
exempt property. Wide variations appear when the Florida counties
are examined in relation to local initiative. Wider variations
appear when dollars per unit of educational load as a result of
local initiative are examined among the several counties in Florida.
The amount of initiative and the dollar distribution resulting from
initiative are two separate and distinct measures. Local ability
directly affects the dollar distribution resulting from a given
level of local initiative.

CHAPTER VI

THE DEVELOPMENT OF A MEASURE OF SOCIAL CLIMATE
ASSOCIATED WITH LOCAL INITIATIVE

The several counties in Florida demonstrate wide variation in financial ability, effort, and initiative. Financial ability varies from $37,509.00 to $212,043.00 in equalized assessed valuation of property per unit of educational load, or a range of $174,534.00. Local effort varies from 6.3 mills to 26.3 mills or a range of 20.0 mills. Local initiative varies from .3 mills to 20.3 mills or a range of 20.0 mills. In summary, local ability, local effort, and local initiative indicate wide contrasts both in material possessions and in overt actions relative to the support of education. Assuming material possessions and overt actions are not concomitant, it is possible that some of the variation is the result of social climate. Does the social climate account for part of the variation between local ability and local initiative?[1] It is the purpose in this chapter to develop a measure of social climate which is associated with voluntary effort to support education. The interaction of social climate, local ability, and local initiative will be examined.

---

[1]Economists are frequently plagued in their efforts to predict spending behavior from rational formulae based upon ability and need by the persistent outcroppings of seemingly irrational behavior on the part of communities. Statistical measure of financial effort and initiative are the recorded actions of living people.

Some Problems in Measuring Social Climate

The state of Florida is divided into 67 political sub-divisions. The 67 counties are subsidiary governmental units of the state. Since 1947 the county and the local school district represent the same geographical area, therefore any measure of social climate in a school district is a measure of social climate in a county. The smallest county has an area of 264 square miles and the largest county has an area of 2,054 square miles. Population distribution varies from sparce rural counties to almost completely urban counties. Political subdivisions within the counties vary from a loose federation of isolated hamlets to areas approaching metropolitan classification. The natality of population varies from counties with predominantly second and third generation "native stock" to counties having cosmopolitan mixtures. Recent population change varies from an average annual decrease of 4.1 per cent to an average annual increase of 24.1 per cent. Some counties are characterized by a high degree of functional specialization while other counties are characterized by varying degrees of functional diversity. These and many other considerations render the measurement of social climate both difficult and subject to inaccuracy.

Out of the diversity or lack of diversity in a county must come actions and decisions and it is the thesis in this study that social climate does make a difference in community behavior. Pierce, et al. made the following assertion:

> So, a community is neither a hodge-podge of unrelated
> activity, or an unordered panorama of life. Its variety
> of behaviors, its forces at work, and its decisions add
> up to the community's going somewhere. This composite of
> action has some kind of rhyme and reason. Behavior and
> conduct take place within certain limits, although some
> of these limits sometimes baffle definition.[2]

The "rhyme or reason" of community must in part stem from the direct

or indirect choices of the people.

Research in the area of sociological description falls into

two broad categories: (1) the direct contact type of study charac-

terized by Hollingshead,[3] Lynd and Lynd,[4] and (2) the "external"

approach characterized by Thorndike,[5] Pierce,[6] Yett,[7] and Tryon.[8]

The direct contact type of study is characterized by personal

interaction with the residents of a community. The direct contact

type of community study is sometimes called a "lived-in" study.

Although the direct contact type of community study has much merit,

such a method was not feasible for this study.

---

[2]Truman M. Pierce and others, Community Leadership for
Public Education (New York: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1955), p. 243.

[3]August B. Hollingshead, Elmtown's Youth (New York: John
Wiley and Sons, 1949).

[4]Robert S. Lynd and Helen M. Lynd, Middletown (New York:
Harcourt, Brace and Company, 1929).

[5]Edward L. Thorndike, Your City (New York: Harcourt, Brace
and Company, 1939).

[6]Truman M. Pierce, Controllable Community Characteristics
Related to the Quality of Education (New York: Teachers College,
Columbia University, 1947).

[7]Frank A. Yett, "The Determination of Structural Pattern in
a Population of Comparable Governmental or Demographic Units," un-
published Ed. D. dissertation, University of California, 1956).

[8]Robert C. Tryon, Identification of Social Areas by Cluster
Analysis (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1955).

The external type of community study is based upon the use of quantified data selected from official publications or evolved from a contrived instrument. The extent of measurement may be in the form of a single statistic[9] or it may consist of a matrix of hundreds of items.[10]

The measurement of social climate in this study was based upon the use of quantified data obtained from governmental agencies. The empirical approach was based upon the following assumptions:

1. Artificial boundaries such as county lines are not as different from the "social," "economic," or "physical" characteristics of the area included that the patterns of likenesses and differences are distorted excessively.

2. The characteristics of a county are somewhat revealed by the combination of measures which describe the area.

3. Data reported by governmental agencies are sufficiently valid and reliable to be used as a basis for analysis.

The following criteria were used in selecting data:

1. The data must be recent enough to give a reasonably fair measure of the dimension.

2. The data must have sufficient range and spread to reveal discrete measures for the several counties.

3. Certain data are untenable because of their multi-dimensional characteristics.

---

[9]New England School Development Council, *New England Finances Public Education* (Cambridge: Spaulding House, 1958), p. 18.

[10]Yett, *op. cit.*

The preliminary investigation involved the selection of data clustered around six dimensions of a society. The following measures were selected:

1. Items of health

    a. Infant mortality rate per 1,000 population

    b. Infections and infestious disease rate per 100,000 population

    c. Suicide rate per 100,000 population

2. Item of education

    a. Median school years completed by persons 25 years of age and over

3. Items of population composition

    a. Per cent population 65 years of age and over

    b. Per cent population classified as white

    c. Per cent population male

4. Items of social stability

    a. Divorce rate per 100,000 population

    b. Per cent homes owner-occupied

    c. Per cent population change 1950-1956

5. Item of population distribution

    a. Per cent population urban

6. Items of economic distribution

    a. Personal income per unit of educational load

    b. Per cent of personal income in transfer payments

The 13 measures included in the preliminary investigation were selected from an original list of 25. The following data were rejected because they were not of recent origin and also lacked sufficient spread of cases:

1. Per cent of population classified as white

2. Per cent of population male

3. Per cent of population 65 years of age and over

4. Per cent of homes owner-occupied

The following data were rejected because of insufficient spread of cases:

1. Divorce rate per 100,000 population

2. Suicide rate per 100,000 population

The following data were rejected because of incomplete reporting:

1. Infectious and infestious disease rate

2. Infant mortality rate

The four measures chosen from the list of 13 that best fit the criteria for selection were as follows:

1. Median school years completed by persons 25 years of age and over.

2. Aggregate personal income per unit of educational load.

3. Per cent change in population from 1950 to 1956.

4. Per cent of aggregate personal income in transfer payments.

The several measures were intercorrelated. The several correlations were plotted on scattergrams to show the distributional pattern

of the cases. Each of the correlations demonstrated a degree of
linearity in the distribution of cases. The distributional pattern
seemed to indicate, within a range, that the correlations were not
greatly distorted as a result of the atypical position of a limited
number of cases.

The selected measures for social climate were correlated with
initiative. The several correlations were plotted on scattergrams
to show the distributional pattern of the cases. The distributional
pattern seemed to indicate, within a range, that the correlations
were not greatly distorted as a result of the atypical position of a
limited number of cases.

The following matrix of intercorrelation was indicated:

	X_1	X_2	X_3	X_4	Y_1
X_1	1.000	.764	.593	-.458	.521
X_2	..	1.000	.747	-.971	.531
X_3	..	..	1.000	-.636	.537
X_4	..	..	..	1.000	-.195
Y_1	..	..	..	..	1.000

X_1 Median school years completed for persons 25 years of age
and over

X_2 Aggregate personal income per unit of educational load

X_3 Per cent change in population from 1950 to 1956

X_4 Per cent aggregate personal income in transfer payments

Y_1 Local initiative

The particular measure of social climate sought in this study is a measure which is associated with local initiative toward the support of education. The factor X_4 was rejected because of the limited correlation with local financial initiative.

The following multiple correlations were calculated:

$$R_{Y_1 \cdot X_1 X_2} = .556$$
$$R_{Y_1 \cdot X_1 X_3} = .593$$
$$R_{Y_1 \cdot X_2 X_3} = .574$$

The multiple correlation $Y_1 \cdot X_1 X_3$ appears to be the best for the following reasons:

1. The multiple correlation $Y_1 \cdot X_1 X_3$ is the highest of the three multiple correlations.

2. The intercorrelation between X_1 and X_2 is .764, between X_1 and X_3 is .593, and between X_2 and X_3 is .747; therefore the two factors have the lowest intercorrelation. There is a possibility that there is a greater difference in the measured aspects of social climate than in the other correlations.

3. It is desired to avoid using an economic factor in the index of social climate because certain correlations are run between this index and financial factors. It would increase the multiple correlation only slightly if $X_1 X_2 X_3$ were included in the index and it would also involve the use of a financial factor in the index. Therefore the decision was made to include only items X_1 and X_3 in the index of social climate.

TABLE 51

MEDIAN SCHOOL YEARS COMPLETED BY PERSONS TWENTY-FIVE
YEARS OF AGE AND OVER

Median Years	Number of Counties
11.1-11.5	3
10.6-11.0	2
10.1-10.5	2
9.6-10.0	7
9.1- 9.5	6
8.6- 9.0	15
7.6- 8.9	10
7.1- 7.5	6
6.6- 7.0	8
6.1- 6.5	0
5.6- 6.0	2

Source: U. S. Bureau of the Census, Seventeenth Census of the
United States: 1950. Population, Vol. II, Part 10; Washington, D. C.:
Government Printing Office, 1952, pp. 29-30.

TABLE 52

PER CENT CHANGE IN POPULATION FROM 1950 TO 1956

Per Cent Population Change	Number of Counties
140-159	1
120-139	1
100-119	0
80- 99	1
60- 79	2
40- 59	9
20- 39	25
0- 19	13
-20- -1	14
-40--21	1

Source: Wylie Kilpatrick, "Personal Income Received in Florida
Counties: 1956," Economic Leaflets, Vol. XVII, No. 5 (May, 1958), p. 2.

The index of social climate could be determined from a multiple regression equation using Y_1 as the criterion and X_1 and X_3 as the independent variables. The zero-order correlation Y_1X_1 is .521 and Y_1X_3 is .537, the two correlations are very near equal and would appear to exert about the same influence. The decision was made to allow equal weighting for the two factors which comprise the index of social climate.

Technique for Scaling Social Climate

Education level and population change were reduced to measures with a mean of 50 and a standard deviation of ten. The following formulae were used:

$$\overline{X} = M' + \left(\frac{\sum x'}{n}\right) i$$

$$\sum x^2 = \left[\sum x'^2 - \frac{(\sum x)^2}{n}\right] i^2$$

$$\sigma' = \sqrt{\frac{\sum x^2}{n}}$$

$$Z = 50 + 10 \left(\frac{X - \overline{X}}{\sigma}\right)$$

The two components of the scale for social climate have about the same individual correlations with initiative. The similarity in correlation indicates the two factors exert approximately the same influence and should be weighted about equal. Education level was combined with population change in the following manner:

$$\text{Social climate} = \frac{Z^{X_1} + Z^{X_3}}{2}$$

The correlation of social climate with local initiative was .578, this was only slightly less than $R_{Y_1 \cdot X_1 X_3}$. The equal weighting of the two factors in the social climate index produce a satisfactory measure of social climate.

The measure of social climate as developed in this study was a composite of median school years completed by persons 25 years of age and over and per cent change in population from 1950 to 1956. Table 53 shows the measure of climate for the several counties in Florida. Social climate has a variation from 33.0 to 77.0 or a range of 44.0.

Summary

Social climate represents a measure of selected factors associated with local financial initiative. The measure of social climate was developed by selecting quantified characteristics of a population clustered around six areas. Thirteen measures were analyzed in relation to a criterion for selection and four of the 13 measures were accepted. Two of the four measures were found to be best suited as components for a scale of social climate. The two components were standardized to measures with a mean of 50 and a standard deviation of ten. Social climate was expressed as an average of the two standardized measures.

TABLE 53

SOCIAL CLIMATE FOR THE FLORIDA COUNTIES

County	Social Climate	County	Social Climate
Alachua	54.3	Lee	59.0
Baker	41.8	Leon	54.0
Bay	51.1	Levy	38.5
Bradford	48.6	Liberty	36.6
Brevard	71.3	Madison	40.0
Broward	77.0	Manatee	54.3
Calhoun	40.2	Marion	53.0
Charlotte	49.8	Martin	52.8
Citrus	46.7	Monroe	63.6
Clay	53.8	Nassau	48.8
Collier	59.2	Okaloosa	60.2
Columbia	46.1	Okeechobee	46.1
Dade	65.0	Orange	65.5
DeSoto	46.6	Osceola	50.8
Dixie	41.0	Palm Beach	59.7
Duval	56.1	Pasco	51.7
Escambia	53.7	Pinellas	64.5
Flagler	42.2	Polk	52.5
Franklin	40.7	Putnam	50.6
Gadsden	43.0	St. Johns	52.4
Gilchrist	40.2	St. Lucie	55.6
Glades	47.3	Santa Rosa	50.7
Gulf	47.0	Sarasota	65.2
Hamilton	34.9	Seminole	51.3
Hardee	49.0	Sumter	44.8
Hendry	48.1	Suwannee	41.4
Hernando	51.6	Taylor	41.2
Highlands	51.5	Union	37.3
Hillsborough	54.4	Volusia	57.5
Holmes	37.9	Wakulla	38.8
Indian River	54.2	Walton	43.1
Jackson	40.8	Washington	38.9
Jefferson	33.0		
Lafayette	40.7		
Lake	53.7		

CHAPTER VII

THE RELATIONSHIP OF CERTAIN CULTURAL FACTORS TO
LOCAL INITIATIVE IN THE FINANCIAL SUPPORT OF
EDUCATION IN FLORIDA

Local initiative represents an additional tax burden assumed
by local school districts in order to increase the expenditures for
education beyond the state foundation program minimum. Local ability
is the tax base against which local school taxes are levied. Social
climate as defined in this study is an index of certain cultural
aspects which are associated with local financial initiative. It
is the purpose in this chapter to examine the relationship of the
index of social climate developed in Chapter VI to the variation
between local ability and local initiative.

The following matrix of intercorrelation was indicated:

	X_1	X_2	X_3
X_1	1.000	.562	.578
X_2	..	1.000	.641
X_3	..	..	1.000

X_1 Local financial initiative

X_2 Local financial ability

X_3 Social climate

Does the social climate account for part of the variation in local
initiative?

Social Climate and Ability

The two components of the scale for social climate as used
in this study showed rather high correlations with economic measures.
Education level had a .764 correlation with personal income per
educational load unit, a -.458 correlation with per cent of aggre-
gate personal income in transfer payments, and a .699 correlation
with ability as defined in this study. Per cent population change
had a .747 correlation with personal income per educational load
unit, and a -.636 correlation with per cent of aggregate personal
income in transfer payments. The negative correlations with the
transfer payment item indicates a reduction in dependency payments
as educational level rises and also with population expansion.

Social climate had a correlation of .641 with ability.
The pattern of distribution indicated that a linear relationship
existed between the two measures. Special notice was given to
six cases which showed distinct variation from the linear relation-
ship. Three cases had low ability associated with high social
climate and three cases had high ability associated with low social
climate. The correlation of social climate with ability was .751
when the six cases were removed. The correlation of .641 between
social climate and ability has a .41 coefficient of determination
when the 67 cases were included. This means the factors used to
measure social climate accounted for 41 per cent of the variation
between social climate and local ability. The .751 correlation
between social climate and ability has a .564 coefficient of

determination when 61 cases were included. This means the factors
used to measure social climate accounted for 56 per cent of the
variation between social climate and ability when based upon 61
cases.

These data indicate that a significant relationship exists
between social climate and ability. These data also indicate the
presence of other variables not measured in the relationship.
Social climate as defined in this study is associated with ability
but social climate and ability are not coterminous.

Social Climate and Initiative

Social climate had a correlation of .578 with initiative.
The pattern of distribution indicated that a degree of linearity
existed between the two measures. The .624 correlation between
social climate and initiative has a .33 coefficient of determination.
This means the factors used to measure social climate accounted for
33 per cent of the variation between social climate and initiative.
Local financial initiative (action) tends to increase as the level
of the selected factors representing social climate rise. There
is a significant relationship between the selected social charac-
teristics and local initiative but there are also other variables
not measured in the relationship.

Initiative and Ability

Local initiative had a correlation of .562 with local ability.
The pattern of distribution indicated a linear relationship existed

between the two measures. Special notice was given to the fact that ten cases showed low ability associated with high initiative and two cases showed high ability associated with low initiative. The correlation of initiative and ability when the 12 cases were removed was .767. The coefficient of determination was .31 when the 67 cases were included. This means the correlation accounts for 31 per cent of the variation between initiative and ability. The coefficient of determination was .59 when the 55 cases were included. The correlation accounted for 59 per cent of the variation between the two measures. Local financial initiative tends to increase as the level of financial ability increases. There is a significant relationship between local initiative and financial ability but there are also other variables not measured in the relationship.

Conclusions

The data presented in this dissertation indicate the following relationships exist in the state of Florida:

1. There is a .641 correlation between the index of social climate and local financial ability. There is a significant relationship between certain cultural characteristics and local financial ability to support education. The data indicate that there are other variables not measured in the relationship between certain cultural characteristics and local financial ability.

2. There is a .562 correlation between local financial initiative and financial ability. There is a significant relationship between local financial initiative and financial ability. The data indicate that there are other variables not measured in the relationship between local financial initiative and financial ability.

3. There is a .578 correlation between the index of social climate and local financial initiative. There is a significant relationship between certain cultural characteristics and local financial initiative. The data indicate that local financial initiative tends to increase as the level of certain cultural characteristics rise. The data indicate that there are other variables of the social climate not measured in the relationship between certain cultural characteristics and local financial initiative.

The findings within the limitations of this dissertation indicate that local financial initiative for the support of schools exists in varying degrees among the several counties in Florida. Local financial initiative is associated with financial ability but there exists some variation between local ability and local initiative.

It was found that certain aspects of the social climate have an effect upon the willingness of the people to tax themselves beyond the required tax effort for participation in the state foundation program.

The investigation of the relationship of certain cultural characteristics to local financial initiative revealed certain supplementary findings which have a significant relationship to financial

support for education in Florida. What other factors or conditions
appear to impinge upon local ability that may account for some of
the variations in local initiative? What implications for adminis-
tration and school legislation may be drawn from among the relation-
ships?

Supplementary Findings

The positive relationship between initiative and ability
in Florida is not consistent with data on a nation-wide basis.
Johns[1] found a –.71 correlation between ability and effort when
net personal income per school-age child was correlated with the
per cent that state-local school revenue is of net personal income.
The National Education Association reported:

> Of the 16 states with lowest current school expenditure
> per pupil in 1950-51 (less than $200), 11 made efforts above
> the United States average. Of the eight states making great-
> est effort, only one was among the ten spending the most money
> per pupil ($250 or more), and two were among the 16 lowest
> in per-pupil expenditure (less than $200).[2]

These data indicate Florida presents a picture quite different from
the national trend. Instead of local effort decreasing with the
rise in ability, local effort increases with ability. Also local
initiative increases with local ability in Florida. Analysis of
the data seems to indicate the following:

---

[1] Roe L. Johns, *Ability and Effort of the States to Support
the Public Schools* (Washington, D. C.: Division of Legislation and
Federal Relations, National Education Association, 1958), p. 10.

[2] *Educational Differences Among the States* (Washington, D. C.:
Research Division, National Education Association, 1954), p. 14.

1. High income states tend to have higher expenditures for schools than low income states.

2. Low income states with limited tax resources are required to make greater tax effort to provide schools and even then the expenditure per pupil remains low.

3. The measure of local effort for individual states is dependent upon the state-local plan for distribution of school funds. Evidence indicates approximately 55 per cent of school support comes from local sources for the nation as a whole.

The analysis within the limitations of this dissertation indicated that the state-local plan for financing education in Florida did relate local ability to local required effort for participation in the state foundation program. The several school districts in Florida do have tax leeway for support beyond the required statutory minimum tax effort for participation in the state foundation program. Evidence within the limitations of this dissertation also indicated that the tax structure in the state of Florida could be a factor influencing the extent of local financial initiative. The factor of lay and professional leadership was not specifically studied in this dissertation but it would appear that leadership may be a factor which accounts for some local initiative. It is the purpose in this section to analyze certain factors that appear to be partial determinants of the relationship between local financial initiative and local financial ability in Florida.

The state foundation program.--The state foundation program
establishes minimum expenditure levels in all counties. These mini-
mum expenditure levels may be "more than adequate" to meet local
aspiration in counties with low social climate. If the expenditure
level guaranteed by the foundation program exceeds the aspiration
level of the people in the low social climate counties there would
be little incentive for local tax initiative. The situation could
develop to the point that in some cases no tax initiative would be
exerted. Therefore counties with low social climate and low ability
would probably exert limited tax initiative. The foundation program
would exceed their wishes. Conversely, it is possible that counties
with low ability and somewhat higher social climate might tend to
exert more tax initiative.

It is quite possible in a state with no foundation program
or substantial state funds for equalization, that the situation
within the state would be reversed. School districts with low ability
would have to make higher local effort in proportion to ability than
higher ability districts in order to have any kind of a school system.
This being true a negative correlation between ability and initiative
would result. Myers[3] found little, if any, correlation between
ability and effort in Florida before the state foundation program was
established.

It is possible that if the federal government appropriated
sufficient funds to assure a foundation program higher than the low

---

[3]Herman C. Myers, "A Study of Certain Phases of Tax Effort in
Relation to Taxpaying Ability in Florida," unpublished Master's thesis,
University of Florida, 1950, p. 121.

aspiration level of low ability states that the negative correlation between ability and effort would become positive. Also the negative correlation between social climate and effort would become positive.

There are incentives built into the state foundation program that make the addition of special programs possible with a limited amount of additional local initiative. Some of the special programs are kindergartens, adult education classes, exceptional child programs, junior college programs, and summer recreation programs. It is possible that higher ability counties with higher local aspiration tend to establish more of the special programs. If this be the case there would be an accompanying increase in local initiative with the increase in ability.

In summary, the state foundation program would appear to be a strong factor in determining the positive relationship between local ability and local initiative. The foundation program and the local aspiration level both appear to have an influence on local initiative.

Taxation in Florida.--The use of state-collected Racing Commission tax funds could have a limiting effect on local initiative in the low ability counties. Data presented in Table 34 show Racing Commission funds represent 2.43 per cent of aggregate funds for school support in Florida. The data also show counties with low personal income per capita tend to use Racing Commission funds for a considerable portion of the local contribution to the school budget. For example, in counties with personal income per capita "$600 to $800," 17.34 per cent of aggregate funds for support of schools come from

Racing Commission funds. Local funds comprise 11.01 per cent of the aggregate for the same group of counties. In the counties with personal income per capita "$2,000 and over," Racing Commission funds comprise .47 per cent of the aggregate while local funds comprise 63.30 per cent of the aggregate. Racing Commission funds are distributed equally among the several counties. The use of the Racing Commission fund is determined as follows: (1) action of the county commissioners, or (2) the Legislature by special local act having local application. The counties with low income per capita usually have a low educational load and tend to use Racing Commission funds to make up a sizable portion of the local contribution to the school budget. The use of Racing Commission funds provides additional local school support without requiring additional local initiative. The effect is for low ability counties to meet and exceed the state foundation program minimum by exerting limited tax initiative. It is possible for counties with low ability and somewhat higher social climate to make extensive use of Racing Commission funds plus limited local initiative and provide a school program commensurate with the local aspiration level.

The Constitutional limitation on school tax levies accompanied by low assessment ratio creates a constricting effect on local initiative. Table 54 shows the effect of low assessment ratios on required tax levies for participation in the state foundation program. Low assessment ratio limits local initiative or the results of local initiative in the following ways: (1) low assessment ratio increases the required tax levy for participation in the state foundation

program, (2) the increase in required tax levy reduces the tax
leeway for exerting initiative, and (3) low assessment ratio reduces
the revenue from each mill of tax initiative levied. Data presented
in Table 43 indicates the ratio of assessed valuation to equalized
assessed valuation was lower for counties grouped in the categories
of low personal income per capita. These data indicate a low ability
county with a low assessment ratio will exert limited initiative
regardless of the tax rate. The evidence indicates that low assess-
ment ratios are not limited to low income per capita counties. The
same three results on local initiative are true regardless of the
level of local ability.

TABLE 54

ASSESSMENT RATIO AND LOCAL INITIATIVE IN SELECTED COUNTIES

County	Required Tax for Founda- tion Program	Tax Leeway for Local Initiative	Ability Per Educational Load Unit	Revenue from One Mill on Ability Per Educational Load Unit
A	13.62 mills	6.38 mills	$ 25,443	$ 25.44
B	13.10	6.90	20,732	20.73
C	12.46	7.54	35,283	35.28
D	5.46	14.54	221,504	221.50
E	4.54	15.46	296,246	296.25
F	4.16	15.84	296,851	296.85

The research of the Florida Citizens Tax Council revealed
state taxes as a total were about the same ratio to personal income

regardless of the level of income per capita. State taxes as a total tend to be regressive. The regressivity of state taxes can have the indirect effect of reducing local initiative. The reduction in initiative would come from the lower ability counties contributing a greater amount of tax revenue in proportion to ability to the state treasury, part of which is remitted to the county as the state portion of the foundation program.

In summary, the over-all tax program in the state of Florida may have a limiting effect on local initiative. Counties can limit tax initiative by the level of property assessment ratio. The composite of state administered taxes can limit local initiative as a result of tax regression.

Lay and professional leadership.--The role of lay and professional leadership may account for some of the variation between ability and initiative. The aspiration level of a community can hardly be considered a fixed quantity. The aspiration level of a community appears to be an important factor in determining local initiative when related to the state foundation program. If the aspiration level can be raised then local initiative will probably increase.

Lay and professional leadership may be an important factor in increasing local initiative by increasing the assessment ratio for property. Communities with high ability and low property assessment ratios may have a conservative power structure. The improvement of property assessment ratios will increase the opportunity

for greater local initiative and a greater return from each mill
of local initiative.

Lay and professional leadership may increase local initia-
tive by adapting the school program to the needs of the community.
The expression of local tax initiative is the result of a developed
desire on the part of the community. The tax burden assumed in the
form of local initiative is an overt expression of the community
desire for greater educational opportunity. There would appear to
be little hope for the expression of local initiative unless there
was a recognized need for the tax effort. The challenge to lay and
professional leadership would appear to be twofold: (1) the adapta-
tion of the school program to the needs of the community, and (2)
to increase the aspiration level of the community.

In summary, the role of lay and professional leadership
probably is an important factor in accounting for some of the varia-
tion between local initiative and local ability. Local initiative
appears to be related to the aspiration level of the community in
Florida. The aspiration level does not appear to be a fixed quantity
and therefore presents a challenge to lay and professional leadership.

Conclusions Related to Supplementary Findings

The state foundation program would appear to be a strong fac-
tor in relating local ability to local initiative in Florida. Evidence
expressly cited indicated that there was considerable change in the
relationship between local effort and local ability after the state
of Florida adopted a state foundation program. The over-all tax

structure appears to be an important factor in relating local ability
to local initiative. The level of assessment practice can have a
limiting effect on local initiative. State administered taxes would
appear to have a degree of tax regression which could produce a
limitation of local financial initiative. Lay and professional
leadership appear to be an important factor in relating local finan-
cial ability to local financial initiative.

The evidence indicates that in Florida there exists a relation-
ship between certain cultural characteristics, local initiative, and
local ability that may not exist in many other states. The fact
that local ability, local initiative, and certain cultural character-
istics show a positive relationship lead to the necessity for examin-
ing some of the implications for the existing relationships.

Some Implications of the Study

1. *Is local initiative important?*—The result of local initia-
tive is to increase the level of expenditure per unit of educational
load. Local initiative at higher ability levels results in a consider-
able increase in expenditure per unit of educational load. With the
decline in ability there is also a decline in the dollar return on
local initiative. There appears to be a point at which the dollar
result of local initiative becomes negligible. The monetary value
attached to local initiative is relative to local ability. There may
well be a point in terms of economic factors at which the encourage-
ment of local initiative becomes harmful.

The measure of local initiative in terms of tax effort in general declines with local ability. The fluctuation of local initiative in relation to local ability indicates local initiative is not a direct result of local ability. The interplay of aspiration level would appear to account for some of the variation between the two measures. The value attached to local initiative in terms of tax effort appears to be relative. High aspiration level accompanied by considerable initiative when related to a reasonable level of ability does substantially increase the level of support. High aspiration level accompanied by considerable initiative when related to a limited level of ability produces a limited increase in the level of support. There well may be a point in terms of level of ability at which local initiative accomplishes no monetary return for the aspiration level. The situation becomes a matter of aspiring for a degree of "adaptability" in the realm of mediocrity.

Local initiative from a monetary point of view is not of itself "good." Local initiative from a monetary point of view is relative to the economic base on which local initiative operates. The importance of local initiative needs to be examined in relation to values other than the monetary. Local initiative would appear to increase the level of interest in the local schools. Local initiative would appear to encourage the development of local policies and encourage experimentation. The non-monetary values attached to local initiative over the long run might advance the level of social climate.

In summary, local initiative needs to be viewed from two points of view. Local initiative when operating on a reasonable level of ability does increase the monetary contribution toward school support. Local initiative when operating on a limited level of ability does little toward increasing the monetary level of school support. Local initiative, regardless of the level of ability, probably has important effects on school operation that cannot be measured in terms of money. Local initiative would appear to be an important factor in school operation.

2. What role for social climate?—The level of social climate appears to be somewhat related to local ability. The dimensions of social climate are broader than the one factor of economic potential. Some of the fluctuation of local initiative in relation to local ability appear in part to be influenced by the level of social climate. Local aspiration level would appear to be associated with social climate and local aspiration level appears to be a factor influencing local initiative. The influence of social climate on local initiative cannot be stated in terms of cause-effect because of intervening variables.

The possibilities for social climate to be a factor in determining local initiative appear to be relative to local ability. If sufficient economic base is available there is opportunity for the social climate to be a factor in raising the level of support through local initiative. Regardless of the level of social climate if sufficient economic base is available the interplay of leadership and other factors could bring about greater local initiative. In this

setting, over the long run social climate can be raised. When the social climate is raised there is a possibility for raising the aspiration level which in turn can increase local initiative.

The constricting effect of low ability limits the possibility for social climate to produce an increase in local initiative that substantially increases educational opportunity. Limited educational opportunity over the long run would appear to have a retrogressive effect on social climate.

The problem of maintaining a population in both high and low ability areas should be approached on the basis of free and equal choice among alternative economic opportunities. If people are forced to stay in low economic areas because their lack of training permits no other choice, certain areas of low ability may well drift toward an underprivileged peasantry. Can America afford to perpetuate a socio-economic system that waits for mediocrity to improve mediocrity? Can America afford to allow any developing aspirations for better schools among low ability districts to be thwarted by economic barriers?

3. <u>What role for the foundation program?</u>--The evidence seems to indicate the state foundation program is a strong factor in relating local initiative to local ability. The state foundation program is theoretically equivalent to average demand. The guaranteed minimum in the foundation program may be equal to or exceed the aspiration level of certain low ability areas. It is possible that the minimum level of the foundation program should be raised considerably

above the aspiration level of certain low ability areas. It is possible that America can ill afford to wait for the slow process of self-improvement among the low ability districts. The raising of the level of the foundation program probably should be accompanied by formula adjustments to retain some latitude for local initiative among the low ability districts. Local latitude for initiative would encourage local interest in developing the educational program. Local initiative would offer some opportunity for local experimentation and self-improvement.

The raising of the foundation program minimum level could have an expanding effect on local initiative at the higher levels of ability. The expansion could be in two directions: (1) greater expenditure for the existing program, and (2) greater use of special programs by taking advantage of the incentive within the foundation program.

In summary, the state foundation program appears to be an important factor in relating local initiative to local ability. The effect of raising the minimum level of the foundation program would assure greater expenditures for education among the lower ability districts and probably encourage greater expenditure among the higher ability districts. It would appear the foundation program should retain a degree of latitude for local initiative regardless of the level of ability.

4. **What role for leadership?**—The analysis within this study did not include the factor of leadership. Some of the variation between local ability and local initiative is probably due to the

interplay of lay and professional leadership. The role of leadership
at the different levels of social climate would present a complex
analysis. The still more complex analysis would be the role of
leadership with local initiative when accompanied by variations in
social climate and ability.

Needed Research

Data in this study revealed certain districts that showed
distinct variations from the general trend. These districts should
be studied in order to analyze the following questions:

1. Why do certain districts with high ability exert
low initiative?

2. Why do certain districts with low ability exert
high initiative?

3. Why do certain districts with low ability have
high social climate?

4. Why do certain districts with high ability have
low social climate?

The second needed study would be an analysis of social
climate, local initiative, and local ability in a series of states
that have distinctly different types of school support programs.

The third needed study involves the desirable minimum level
for a state foundation program. How far above the aspiration level
of low ability districts should the state foundation program be?
How much tax leeway should be retained for local initiative in low
ability districts?

The fourth area of needed research involves an analysis of taxation for school support. Does the local property tax even when equalization is applied provide a suitable vehicle for the expression of local initiative? What is the affect of state administered taxes upon local initiative especially when state administered taxes are regressive? What portion of local taxpaying ability is preempted by state and Federal taxes even when substantial funds are allocated to the county for school support?

The fifth area of needed research is in the area of leadership. How does leadership relate to specific variations between local ability and local initiative? How can leadership affect the actions of the community power structure?

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Bogue, Donald J. State Economic Areas. Washington, D. C.: U. S. Bureau of the Census, Government Printing Office, 1951.

Bureau of Government Research and Service. Summary of Studies of the Florida Citizens Tax Council, 1956-1957. Tallahassee: School of Public Administration, Florida State University, 1958.

Burke, Arvid J. Financing Public Schools in the United States. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1957.

Cornell, Francis G., and McLoone, Eugene P. "Finance and Material Management," Review of Educational Research, Vol. XXV, No. 4 (October, 1955), 351-363.

Cornell, Francis G., and others. Financing Education in Efficient School Districts. Champaign: Bureau of Research and Service, College of Education, University of Illinois, 1949.

Cubberley, Elwood P. State School Funds and Their Apportionment. New York: Teachers College, Columbia University, 1905.

Duncan, Otis D., and Reiss, Albert J., Jr. Social Characteristics of Urban and Rural Communities, 1950. New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc., 1956.

Edwards, Newton. The Courts and the Public Schools. Revised edition. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1955.

Florida Citizens Committee on Education. Education and the Future of Florida. Tallahassee: Florida Citizens Committee on Education, 1947.

Florida, Comptroller. Report of the Comptroller of the State of Florida. Tallahassee: Office of Comptroller, 1951.

_____. Report of the Comptroller of the State of Florida. Tallahassee: Office of Comptroller, 1952.

_____. Report of the Comptroller of the State of Florida. Tallahassee: Office of Comptroller, 1953.

_____. Report of the Comptroller of the State of Florida. Tallahassee: Office of Comptroller, 1954.

_____. Report of the Comptroller of the State of Florida. Talla-
hassee: Office of Comptroller, 1955.

_____. Report of the Comptroller of the State of Florida. Talla-
hassee: Office of Comptroller, 1956.

Florida. Constitution of the State of Florida (1885). 1949 edition.

Florida, Department of Education. Biennial Report Superintendent of
Public Instruction, 1954-56. Tallahassee: State Department
of Education, 1957.

_____. Florida's Minimum Foundation Program. Tallahassee: State
Department of Education, 1956.

_____. "Application of Index of Taxpaying Ability, 1947-48."
Tallahassee: State Department of Education, 1947. (Mimeo-
graphed.)

_____. "Application of Index of Taxpaying Ability, 1952-53."
Tallahassee: State Department of Education, 1952. (Mimeo-
graphed.)

_____. "Application of Index of Taxpaying Ability, 1955-56."
Tallahassee: State Department of Education, 1955. (Mimeo-
graphed.)

Florida Legislative Council. Five Years of the Minimum Foundation
Program. Tallahassee: Florida Legislative Council, 1953.

Florida Legislative Council and Reference Bureau. Financing Public
School Under the Florida Minimum Foundation Program. Talla-
hassee: Florida Legislative Council and Reference Bureau,
1957.

Florida Railroad Assessment Board. "Railroad and Telegraph Valuation
by Counties." Tallahassee: Railroad Assessment Board, 1958.
(Mimeographed.)

Florida. Revised Statutes (1957).

Garner, Curtis R. "A Study to Determine the Validity of the Uniform-
Assessment Assumption Implied in the Use of Certain Measures
of Local Taxpaying Ability in Arkansas." Unpublished Ed.D.
dissertation, North Texas College, 1956.

Hollingshead, August B. Elmtown's Youth. New York: John Wiley
and Sons, 1949.

Johns, Roe L. Ability and Effort of the States to Support the Public Schools. Washington, D. C.: Division of Legislation and Federal Relations, National Education Association, 1958.

———. The Property Tax and Public School Financing. Washington, D. C.: Division of Legislation and Federal Relations, National Education Association, 1958.

Johns, Roe L., and Meyer, Herbert A. "A Method for Calculating an Economic Index of the Taxpaying Ability of Local School Units." Gainesville: College of Education, University of Florida, April, 1952. (Mimeographed.)

Kilpatrick, Wylie. "Personal Income Received in Florida Counties: 1956." Economic Leaflets, Vol. XVII, No. 5 (May, 1958).

Kretschmar, Ernest L. "A Study of the Effects of the Minimum Foundation Program Law Upon the Schools of Manatee County." Unpublished Master's thesis, University of Florida, 1950.

Leps, Joseph M., and Qualls, LeRoy L. "Financing Public Schools in Florida, 1957-58." Economic Leaflets, Vol. XVII, No. 21 (February, 1958).

Lynd, Robert S., and Lynd, Helen M. Middletown. New York: Harcourt, Brace and Company, 1929.

McClure, William P. An Analysis of the Illinois Foundation Program of Public School Support. Urbana: Bureau of Research and Service, College of Education, University of Illinois, 1952.

Morphet, Edgar L., and Lindman, Erick L. Public School Finance Programs of the Forty-Eight States. Federal Security Agency, Office of Education, Circular No. 274. Washington, D. C.: Government Printing Office, 1950.

Mort, Paul R., and Cornell, Francis G. Adaptability of Public School Systems. New York: Bureau of Publications, Teachers College, Columbia University, 1938.

Mort, Paul R., and Reusser, Walter C. Public School Finance. 2d ed. New York: McGraw Hill Book Company, Inc., 1951.

Myers, Herman C. "A Study of Certain Phases of Tax Effort in Relation to Taxpaying Ability in Florida." Unpublished Master's thesis, University of Florida, 1950.

National Conference of Professors of Educational Administration. Problems and Issues in Public School Finance. New York: Bureau of Publications, Teachers College, Columbia University, 1952.

National Education Association, Committee on Tax Education and School Finance. Equalization of Property Assessments. Washington, D. C.: National Education Association, 1958.

_____. Guides to the Improvement of the State School Finance Programs. Washington, D. C.: National Education Association, 1958.

_____. New Sources of Local Revenues for Public Schools. Washington, D. C.: National Education Association, 1950.

National Education Association, Education Research Service, American Association of School Administrators. School Finance Series. Washington, D. C.: National Education Association, 1956.

National Education Association, Research Division. Educational Differences Among the States. Washington, D. C.: National Education Association, 1954.

_____. Ranking of the States. Washington, D. C.: National Education Association, 1957.

National Industrial Conference Board. The Economic Almanac for 1942-43. New York: National Industrial Conference Board, 1942.

_____. The Economic Almanac for 1958. New York: Thomas Y. Crowell, 1958.

New England School Development Council. New England Finances Public Education. Cambridge: Spaulding House, 1958.

Odum, Howard W. Southern Regions of the United States. Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, 1936.

Ogburn, William F. Social Characteristics of Cities. Chicago: International City Managers' Association, 1937.

Pierce, Truman M. Controllable Community Characteristics Related to the Quality of Education. New York: Teachers College, Columbia University, 1947.

Pierce, Truman M., and others. Community Leadership for Public Education. New York: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1955.

<u>Public Schools of Davidson County Tennessee</u>. Nashville: Division of Surveys and Field Studies, George Peabody College for Teachers, 1949.

Rosenstengel, William E., and Eastmond, Jefferson N. <u>School Finance Its Theory and Practice</u>. New York: The Ronald Press Company, 1957.

Schultz, William J., and Harriss, C. Lowell. <u>American Public Finance</u> 6th ed. New York: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1954.

Simmons, Russell. "A Study of the Effects of the Minimum Foundation Program on Washington County Schools and the Implications for Future Development." Unpublished Master's thesis, University of Florida, 1953.

Simpson, Edgar R. "The Validity of the Texas Economic Index." Unpublished Ed.D. dissertation, North Texas State College, 1956.

Thorndike, Edward L. <u>Your City</u>. New York: Harcourt, Brace and Company, 1939.

Thorndike, Edward L., and Woodyard, Ella. "The Relation Between the Aesthetic Status of a Community and Its Status in Other Respects." <u>American Journal of Sociology</u>, Vol. XLIX, No. 1 (July, 1943), p. 59.

Tryon, Robert C. <u>Identification of Social Areas by Cluster Analysis</u>. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1955.

U. S. Bureau of the Census. <u>Seventeenth Census of the United States: 1950. Population</u>, Vol. II, Part 10. Washington, D. C.: Government Printing Office, 1952.

_____. <u>Statistical Abstract of the United States: 1958</u>. Washington, D. C.: Department of Commerce, 1958.

_____. <u>Summary of Governmental Finances 1952</u>. G-GF 52 (November, 1953).

_____. <u>Summary of Governmental Finances 1956</u>. G-GF 56 (August, 1957).

U. S. Office of Education. <u>Biennial Survey of Education in the United States: 1952-54</u>. Washington, D. C.: Government Printing Office, 1956.

Walker, Elizabeth Duncan. "The Effects of the Minimum Foundation School Program on the Public Schools of Orange County, Florida." Unpublished Master's thesis, University of Florida, 1950.

Warner, W. Lloyd, and Lunt, Paul S. The Social Life of a Modern Community. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1941.

Yett, Frank A. "The Determination of Structural Pattern in a Population of Comparable Governmental or Demographic Units." Unpublished Ed.D. dissertation, University of California, 1956.

BIOGRAPHICAL SKETCH

Gilbert L. Gentry was born on July 28, 1918, in Ralls County, Missouri. He attended Monroe City Elementary School and Monroe City High School. From 1935 until 1937 he attended Hannibal-LaGrange Junior College. From 1937 until 1939 he attended the University of Missouri, receiving the degree of Bachelor of Science in Education. From 1955 until 1959 he attended the University of Florida, receiving the degrees Master of Education and Education Specialist.

He taught in the high schools at Van Buren, Missouri and Ft. Pierce, Florida; served in the Navy; was employed in industry as a food chemist; and was employed as a graduate assistant while doing graduate work at the University of Florida.

In 1946 he married Miss Mary Bell Trosper.

He is a member of the following honorary and professional fraternities: Phi Kappa Phi, Kappa Delta Pi, and Phi Delta Kappa.

This dissertation was prepared under the direction of chairman of the candidate's supervisory committee and has been approved by all members of that committee. It was submitted to the Dean of the College of Education and to the Graduate Council, and was approved as partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Education.

January, 1959.

_____
Dean, College of Education

_____
Dean, Graduate School

SUPERVISORY COMMITTEE:

_____
Chairman

_____

_____

_____

_____